

THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW.

62

VOL. X. NEW SERIES.

JANUARY—APRIL,

MDCCCLXVIII.

LONDON:  
BURNS, OATES, & CO., 17 PORTMAN STREET,  
AND 63 PATERNOSTER ROW.  
DERBY: RICHARDSON & SONS.  
DUBLIN: JAMES DUFFY; W. B. KELLY.  
1868.

LONDON :

WYMAN AND SONS, PRINTERS, GREAT QUEEN STREET,  
LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.



# CONTENTS.

---

## ART. I.—COUNT DE MONTALEMBERT'S MONKS OF THE WEST.

Characteristics of M. de Montalembert as a public man . . . . .	1
Truthfulness of the present history . . . . .	4
Causes of the comparative oblivion into which the names of saintly Anglo-Saxons have fallen . . . . .	6
The author's most unfounded eulogy of Protestant England . . . . .	11
The state of Great Britain from A.D. 450 to A.D. 550 . . . . .	18
S. Augustine's mission and its progress . . . . .	21
Miracles involved in the history . . . . .	24
Temporary reverse and renewed advance of Christianity in England . .	26
Peculiarities of Anglo-Saxon history, resulting from the fact that the English missionaries were monks . . . . .	31
S. Wilfrid . . . . .	35
His permanent services to the English Church . . . . .	42

---

## ART. II.—ARCHBISHOP MANNING ON THE CENTENARY.

Peculiar importance of this pamphlet among the Archbishop's works . .	45
Condemnableness of Gallicanism . . . . .	46
The modern theory of nationalism . . . . .	49
The author, in elevating the Pontifical office, by no means disparages the Episcopal . . . . .	52
Importance of stating clearly and emphatically the Catholic doctrine on the true relation between Church and State . . . . .	54
Importance at the same time of guarding against prevalent misconcep- tions . . . . .	58
The author's sense of the importance at this time of directly addressing the masses . . . . .	59

## ART. III.—S. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY.

S. Thomas's national character . . . . .	60
The story of his Eastern origin . . . . .	63
His early life . . . . .	65
His habits after his consecration . . . . .	67
The Constitutions of Clarendon . . . . .	70
S. Thomas's ill-advised concession . . . . .	74
His repentance . . . . .	75
The Council of Northampton . . . . .	76
S. Thomas's escape . . . . .	80

## ART. IV.—DOCTRINAL APOSTOLIC LETTERS.

Two objections considered, which have been urged against raising this controversy . . . . .	84
Many Apostolic Letters contain doctrinal instruction . . . . .	89
Thesis 1. The doctrinal instruction of an universal Encyclical is infallible . . . . .	90
Objections considered . . . . .	92
Thesis 2. Every doctrinal act of the Pontiff is infallible which is issued in a general form . . . . .	99
Thesis 3. The Syllabus furnishes an infallible Rule of belief . . . . .	99
Thesis 4. All the Acts from which it is compiled were <i>ex cathedrâ</i> . . . . .	101
Thesis 5. All doctrinal Acts are <i>ex cathedrâ</i> of which the Pope commands the publication . . . . .	103
Thesis 6. All doctrinal Acts are <i>ex cathedrâ</i> which are not intended for the special instruction of those formally addressed . . . . .	105
Thesis 7. All Acts are <i>ex cathedrâ</i> in which the Pontiff pronounces some tenet heretical or unsound . . . . .	106
Thesis 8. All doctrinal Acts are <i>ex cathedrâ</i> which contain certain officially significant words . . . . .	109
Objection considered, "No Act can be <i>ex cathedrâ</i> which is not formally addressed to the Universal Church" . . . . .	109
At last some uncertainty may remain in particular cases . . . . .	114
Testimony of theologians . . . . .	116
Two objections considered, which have been urged against the truth of our general doctrine . . . . .	128

## ART. V.—POPULAR EDUCATION IN ENGLAND.

Popular education has become a party cry . . . . .	131
Rival schemes . . . . .	133
Fearful ignorance of the English lower classes . . . . .	137

## Contents.

iii

Principles of the Secularists . . . . .	147
Falsehood, odiousness, and deadliness of those principles . . . . .	154
The present terrible crisis of English thought . . . . .	163

---

### ART. VI.—TIZZANI ON S. CYPRIAN.

Peculiar character of S. Cyprian . . . . .	165
Mgr. Tizzani's theory on the Saint's controversy with S. Stephen . . . . .	167
His arguments, as a whole, not convincing . . . . .	171
One particular tenet of S. Cyprian's throws great light on the true character of the controversy . . . . .	172
Mgr. Tizzani, however, partially in the right . . . . .	175

---

### ART. VII.—THE SECOND MAN VERIFIED IN HISTORY.

The giving of the Spirit the result of the Incarnation of the Son . . . . .	177
Its generic character . . . . .	180
Its differential marks . . . . .	181
Qualities which it bestows . . . . .	182
Three analogies illustrating it . . . . .	186
Historical fulfilment of the above doctrine . . . . .	190
Actual creation of the Divine society . . . . .	190
Mode of the Truth's transmission in it . . . . .	195
Transmission of Truth connects it with imparting of grace . . . . .	199
This mode of transmitting Truth enjoined by our Lord . . . . .	205
Result, a divine life embracing the intellect and the will . . . . .	207

---

### ART. VIII.—ROME AND THE REVOLUTION.

Retrospect of a year . . . . .	210
Attack of the Revolution on the Papal States . . . . .	211
The Roman army, people, and government . . . . .	212
Catholic reaction in France . . . . .	213
Relations of the French Government with that of Florence . . . . .	215
The Emperor's position . . . . .	218
The debate in the Corps Législatif . . . . .	219
The Italian Ministerial Crisis . . . . .	221
The present situation . . . . .	222

## IX.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Pastorals on the Oxford Question . . . . .	224
Archbishop Manning's recent Sermons . . . . .	225
Essays on Religion and Literature . . . . .	229
F. Perrone on the Errors of Hermes . . . . .	232
Herr Schütz on Ontologism . . . . .	235
The Ubahgs Controversy . . . . .	237
F. Chocarne's Life of F. Lacordaire . . . . .	240
Count de Falloux's Life of Madame Swetchine . . . . .	244
Mr. Carlyle's Shooting Niagara . . . . .	245
M. Nicolas on the Divinity of Christ . . . . .	246
Canon Eccles on Justification . . . . .	250
Dr. Thiel's Epistles of the Roman Pontiffs . . . . .	251
Dr. Meynell's Short Sermons . . . . .	253
The Comedy of Convocation . . . . .	254
Mr. Formby's Cause of Catholic Emigrants . . . . .	258
The Irish Ecclesiastical Record . . . . .	262
Canon Oakeley on Church Choirs . . . . .	264
Letters of a Roman Doctor of Divinity . . . . .	269
The Theories of Copernicus and Ptolemy . . . . .	274
Mr. Anderdon's Sunday Afternoons . . . . .	277
——— Confession . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
——— In the Snow . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Lady Chatterton's Oswald of Deira . . . . .	278

---

ART. X.—ROMAN DOCUMENTS ON A PHILOSOPHICAL CONTROVERSY IN BELGIUM . . . . .	279
--	-----

---

## CONTENTS.

### ART. I.—THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON'S DESPATCHES.

The Duke's character and civil services. . . . .	291
Nature of his correspondence . . . . .	292
Canning's appointment as Foreign Minister . . . . .	293
Real history of that transaction . . . . .	295
Effect of Mr. Canning's appointment . . . . .	298
The Duke and Prince Metternich . . . . .	299
State of Europe when the Congress of Verona met . . . . .	300
Position and policy of Russia . . . . .	301
The Czar's designs on Spain . . . . .	302
The Duke's character of the Spanish nation . . . . .	303
Russia and Turkey . . . . .	306
The Duke and the Irish Catholic Bishops . . . . .	308
Mr. Canning's application to Cardinal Consalvi, touching the see of Cashel . . . . .	309
The Duke's relations with Primate Curtis . . . . .	310
Correspondence between the Duke and Dr. Curtis . . . . .	311
The Duke's opinions and policy in regard to the Catholic Question . . . . .	318

### ART. II.—THE WITNESS OF HERETICAL BODIES TO MARIOLOGY.

Anglicanism, as a theory, is but a very illogical species of rationalism . . . . .	320
A newly-discovered Æthiopic hymn to our Blessed Lady, and what is the earliest and the latest date to which it can be assigned ? . . . .	325
Gnosticism Patripassianism, and Sabellianism . . . . .	332
Bearing of the Gnostic controversy on the dogma of the Incarnation . . . . .	335
Singular clearightedness of Rome, and her anticipation of subsequent controversies. . . . .	337
Importance of this fact in considering the genuineness and date of documents. . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Comparison between the dogmatic language of Hippolytus and of S. Leo . . . . .	338
This Æthiopic hymn is certainly subsequent to the rise of Apolli- narianism . . . . .	341
Indeed, at least as late as the Council of Ephesus, yet earlier than the Council of Chalcedon . . . . .	345
Nor can it have received interpolations at a later period . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Monophysite attempts for a whole century to keep clear of Eutychianism proper . . . . .	346
A vast increase of devotion to our Lady took place throughout the Church just before Eutyches . . . . .	353

A letter against Paul of Samosata falsely ascribed to S. Dionysius of Alexandria . . . . .	356
Great need of learned leisure for English Catholics . . . . .	361

### ART. III.—FIRST AGE OF THE MARTYR CHURCH.

Ignorance of Greek and Roman heathendom that there is a sacred order of moral truth . . . . .	362
This truth Christianity connected with a Person . . . . .	363
The Christian Church, for the first ten generations, a special witness to this union . . . . .	365
Picture of her first seventy years, the Apostolic age . . . . .	367
The Church's internal and external growth in the sixty years which follow . . . . .	372
Attitude of Trajan towards her . . . . .	380
Conduct of Hadrian and of Christians in his reign . . . . .	386
State of Christians under Antoninus Pius . . . . .	389
View which might naturally be taken of Christianity at the conclusion of his reign . . . . .	392

### ART. IV.—S. JEROME.

The period of patristic classics . . . . .	395
S. Jerome's birth . . . . .	397
He goes to Rome for purposes of study . . . . .	398
He lives a few years at Aquileia and then sets out for the East . . . . .	399
His life in the desert . . . . .	400
He goes again to Rome . . . . .	403
He becomes secretary to Pope S. Damasus . . . . .	404
At that Pontiff's death, he finally settles at Bethlehem . . . . .	406
His whole work on the Holy Scriptures . . . . .	413
His contest with Rufinus . . . . .	421
His war for the principle of asceticism . . . . .	424
His anguish at Alarie's capture of Rome . . . . .	428
His death . . . . .	429

### V.—THE RITUALISTS.

Curious development of Tractarianism between 1833 and 1868 . . . . .	430
Tractarianism and Ritualism have both their origin at an earlier period . . . . .	431
Grotesque use by Ritualists of the words "Catholic" and "Protestant" . . . . .	433
The movement is doctrinal, and not merely ritualistic . . . . .	434
Its contrast with early Tractarianism as regards its language towards the Anglican Prayer-book, and towards the Protestant bishops . . . . .	436
The number of Ritualists must be very considerable . . . . .	448

The time seems really coming when almost all Englishmen will be either Catholics or infidels.	451
As regards the great majority of Ritualists, their ignorance of Catholicism appears invincible	454
Their extreme bitterness towards converts is no disproof of this	455

---

VI.—S. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY.

The Archbishop's and the King's friends appear together before the Holy Father, at Sens	458
Banishment from England of the Archbishop's relatives and friends	462
S. Thomas in exile.	463
His legatine powers and their temporary suspension	468
His interview with the King, and resolution to return home.	471
He passes through Canterbury to London	474
The young King commands his return to Canterbury	478
He there keeps his Christmas	479
The murderers arrive there	481
Circumstances of the martyrdom	482

---

ART. VII.—S. LEO'S DOGMATIC LETTER.

This Letter is undoubtedly <i>ex cathedrâ</i> .	489
Yet it is not formally addressed to the Universal Church	490
Nor are its entire contents doctrinal	<i>ib.</i>
It teaches exclusively by way of doctrinal exposition	491
Nor does its wording either expressly or equivalently impose on Catholics the obligation of absolute interior assent to its precise instruction	<i>ib.</i>
Text of the Letter.	492

---

ART. VIII.—THE CASE OF IRELAND BEFORE PARLIAMENT.

Mr. Gladstone's declaration regarding Fenianism	498
Sketch of the history of Fenianism	499
Lord Kimberley's administration	<i>ib.</i>
Lord Abercorn's government	502
The general result an Irish policy on the part of all leading statesmen	508
The Government policy	509
Mr. Gladstone's policy	510
Earl Russell's policy	511
Earl Grey's policy	512
Mr. Bright's policy	513
Mr. Mill's policy	<i>ib.</i>
Want of harmony in the Opposition policy	515
Archbishop Manning's Letter to Earl Grey	516
The attitude of the Irish Catholics	518

## IX.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Discourse of Pope Pius IX.	519
<i>Univers</i> of Feb. 24th.	520
<i>Univers</i> of Feb. 28th.	523
Dublin Meeting on Catholic Education.	<i>ib.</i>
F. Vaughan on Popular Education.	<i>ib.</i>
Bishop Ullathorne on Convents	525
Mr. Maguire's Irish in America	<i>ib.</i>
Dr. Smith's Book of Moses	528
F. Newman's Poems	531
Canon Estcourt on Book of Common Prayer	533
Greenwell's <i>Lacordaire</i>	536
Hegenröther's Life of Photius	538
Church Choirs and Church Music	540
Memoirs of Watts Russell and B. de Quatrebarbes	541
F. Beste's "Victory of Rome"	543
F. Lockhart's "Non Possumus"	547
Mr. Liddon on Our Lord's Divinity	548
Abbé Maynard's "Voltaire"	551
M. Thierry's S. Jérôme	554
Devotions for Advent and Christmas	557
Dr. Gilbert's "Love of Jesus"	558
Mr. White's Massacre of S. Bartholomew	559
Life of S. Francis of Assisi	562
Mrs. Kavanagh's "Instructions for Confession"	<i>ib.</i>
Tales from the Diary of a Sister of Mercy	563
Letter to the <i>Tablet</i> from a Roman Doctor	564
F. Ryder's Letter to Dr. Ward and Dr. Ward's reply	566
F. Ryder to the <i>Tablet</i>	567
Note to article on Ritualism	568

## X.—LETTER ON PROFESSOR UBAGHS AND ONTOLOGISM . . . 569



THE

# DUBLIN REVIEW.

---

JANUARY, 1868.

---

## ART. I.—COUNT DE MONTALEMBERT'S MONKS OF THE WEST.

*Les Moines d'Occident, depuis Saint Benoit jusqu'à Saint Bernard. Par Le Comte de MONTALEMBERT, l'un des quarante de l'Académie Française. Tomes iii., iv., et v. Conversion de l'Angleterre par les Moines. Lecoffre et Cie. Paris : 1867.*

IT is impossible for any Catholic writer to mention the name of the Count de Montalembert without pride and tenderness. We differ from some of his views widely and strenuously; nor would we soften or explain away any such difference if we could, knowing, at least believing as we do, for reasons which our readers will readily understand, that on the issue pending turns the whole policy of the Church towards the world in the age in which we live. But were our difference with him far wider than it is, it would be impossible for us not to love and honour him. There is a spontaneous sincerity, a chivalrous devotion, a simple love of truth for truth's own sake, an utter unselfishness, a frank and hearty manliness about his character which compel one to feel that difference with him, however warm or even bitter it may be, can only be difference for the moment; and that whenever or wherever error may make itself manifest, no consideration of consequences, no false sense of consistency, would keep him for a second on the wrong side. How often, how touchingly has his career, cast in such difficult, and to him peculiarly burdensome days, proved this—days in which there have been many good, but not very many great Catholic public men,—but which history will not pronounce to have been altogether barren in that respect, seeing that Ireland gave us in them O'Connell, and France Montalembert.

May God grant that the work which it is our grateful task to review to-day, and which bears here and there the traces of the pain of spirit in which it was conceived, and the pain of body in which we grieve to hear it is being concluded, may

not be his last service to the Church! In one of its early volumes, he says of himself with a certain sadness, that he is the first of his race who has only made war with the pen, and not the sword. There is, indeed, no more military race in all France than that of which he is the chief, and which, since the time of André de Montalembert d'Essé, one of the true heroes of French military story, has proudly mourned for sixteen of its sons, slain on the field of battle. The family annals tell that seven others only left the camp for their old home in the South, when disabled by wounds; and that in the last century alone, twenty-one Montalemberts were Knights of S. Louis in virtue of distinguished bravery, or long and signal service. And herein surely we find the true clue to M. de Montalembert's character—his high and ardent temper, his unhesitating, uncalculating courage, his touching simplicity of spirit, his impulsive, somewhat headlong freedom of speech. Under the robe of the academician beats the heart of the soldier; and in the tribune of old his sentences rang like the clash of steel. Thus his impulses have often led him far in advance of his time and of his friends—so far that his second thoughts sometimes resentfully condemn those who have simply followed his first to their logical consequences. We have some reason to suppose that our own convictions on the true value of various doctrinal declarations of the Holy Father are not in accordance with M. de Montalembert's present opinions. Yet there is no circumstance in the recent history of the Church which has so brought forward, in the face of the world, the living and teaching power of the Holy See, as the appeal to Rome made by M. de Montalembert with the Abbé Lacordaire and M. La Menais, which led to the promulgation of the Encyclical, *Mirari vos*. Nor is there any modern Catholic writer who has argued so eagerly and so eloquently for the respect due to Papal documents as he has done in several truly remarkable articles contributed to the *Univers* à propos of the Allocutions of Gregory XVI. So in politics. There was a time when M. de Montalembert said that that man was a bad Frenchman and a worse Catholic who did not support Louis Napoleon—and the time of which we speak was the time of the *coup d'état*. History, calmly judging all the circumstances of the case, only half, if even half of which are known to us now, will probably say that M. de Montalembert was right. But M. de Montalembert would hardly say so of himself at any time within the last ten years. There is such a generous ardour and winning genius in all the manifestations of his mind and character as disarms criticism. All we venture to say is that we prefer his first thoughts and their legitimate con-

clusions, to his second thoughts and their over liberal concessions. Born in England, and to some degree owing his earliest education to that country, there is an English side to his character; and we confess we prefer the French side of it—the spirit that comes from the old Crusaders to the tone that charms Pall Mall through all its clubs. To-day we have to consider his genius in a new and, perhaps, in its noblest and most enduring aspect, and to observe how the tribune whose eloquence has swayed stormy assemblies can revive the history of the monks of old, evangelizing barbarous nations in the first dim dawn of Christendom, or weaving the primal threads of its civilization in their silent cells.

The three volumes before us, although an integral part of the Count de Montalembert's great undertaking—the history of the Monks of the West from S. Benedict to S. Bernard—form a whole by themselves, and we need hardly add one specially interesting to Englishmen. They contain indeed a history of their country from the earliest dawn of its national existence down to the middle of the eighth century. We say “the history,” not (as we might have written) the “ecclesiastical history of England,” because in fact in treating of those days no distinction can be made between the two. Whatever there was of civilization, of thought, of education, of legislation, or of political and social improvement; whatever makes the history of those ages more interesting than that of brutes struggling for mastery by sheer force, and literally devouring each other, is as inseparably connected with the action of the Church as are those narratives of individual religious life, which come home so closely to the heart and affections of every Christian reader.

Hume's history of these years does not occupy many pages; yet it is dull to read and impossible to remember. For with his view of history, he had nothing to record except the disputes and broils of those who happened in each generation to be the most powerful men in England. If any one had suggested to him that the quarrels and intermarriages of the great proprietors of England and the Scotch lowlands in his own day deserved to be called “the history of England in the eighteenth century,” he would have been the first to ridicule the strange delusion. Yet, in truth, their position hardly differed from that of the men of whom he writes in the seventh and eighth centuries, except that they were called dukes and earls instead of kings, and that they were so far subjected to the law that they were forced to settle their disputes, not by battles, but by lawsuits, or at the worst by duels. He tells us “The history of that period abounds in names, but is extremely barren of

events, or the events are related so much without circumstances and causes, that the most profound or most eloquent writer must despair of rendering them either instructive or entertaining to the reader. Even the great learning and vigorous imagination of Milton sunk under the weight, and this author scruples not to declare that the skirmishes of kites and crows as much merited a particular narrative as the confused transactions and battles of the Saxon Heptarchy."

Perhaps nothing in literature more strikingly proves how much the interest of a work may depend upon the personal character as well as the talents of a writer than a comparison of the history before us with that of Hume. Where Hume found only a string of barbarous names, Montalembert recalls to life a series of not merely actual men and women, but most markedly of English men and women.

Their lot was cast, indeed, in times very different from ours, but it would be hardly possible to mistake them for members of any other nation. More than this: their individual characters are so well distinguished that we seem to have known them personally, and part with them with regret as old friends as they pass one by one out of our sight. It is not that, like the laureate in his exquisite "*Idylls of the King*," the author has transplanted imaginary persons, formed on the model of men of our own day, to a distant and fabulous period. The heroes of these volumes have all the characteristics of their times. Above all, the great object has been to make their portraits not attractive, but exact. Every one of them is painted as Cromwell, in Macaulay's words, demanded to be painted—"as he was—his face marked with all the blemishes which had been put upon it by war, by sleepless nights, by anxiety, perhaps by remorse; but with valour, policy, authority, and public care written in all its princely lines. If great men knew their own interests, it is thus that they would wish their minds to be portrayed." Our author says—

Do I mean that all was perfect in the monastic institutions of the country and the times which I have undertaken to describe? God forbid that I should so mislead my readers! The farther I advance in my weary and toilsome task—in other words, the nearer I draw to the grave, and the more I feel myself possessed, penetrated, ruled by an ardent and reverential love of truth, the more sure I am that I could not bear to be false to it, even in the interest of all that I most love here below. The bare thought of adding one shade more to all those by which it is already covered fills me with horror (v. 323).

Our readers must not suppose that, in thus speaking of truth as his first object and duty as an historian, the Count de Montalembert means, that he intends, like some who make only

the same profession, to pander to the prejudices of the day, by detailing in a cold, sneering, sarcastic tone every scandal which can be discovered, and by insinuating others which never existed. Nothing can be more opposite to his whole temper. He is fired with a noble enthusiasm, as he retraces the lives of the great Saints who, like the morning star, illuminated the dawn of the English nation. He does not think it necessary, he would certainly have found it impossible, to throw his burning heart into the position of indifference in recounting the struggle between good and evil, light and darkness; but he quotes from M. de Champagny\* the sentiment that an historian is bound to be not indifferent, but only truthful, that he may, nay, must feel on one side or another, but that he is bound to conceal nothing as well as to invent nothing.

In one respect, from the nature of his subject, this duty of truthfulness imposes upon him a necessity which would have been to Macaulay an impossibility. It is impossible to expect that everything in times so remote should be fully explained: and our historian is not ashamed to admit that several things are quite inexplicable. Macaulay's turn of mind almost compelled him to know the motives and feelings of those of whom he wrote, more thoroughly than any of us knows his own. It is impossible not to feel that his picture of Halifax, for instance (although he has laboured to make it impartial, and to conceal none of the blemishes of his hero), is more minute than it could possibly be made without a very considerable exercise of imagination. He seems to know him as Miss Yonge knows one of the characters which she has created. The chief hero of Montalembert's work, beyond a doubt, is S. Wilfrid; and yet he is magnanimous enough to admit that there are things in his own conduct, and much more in the relation towards him both of men and women of undoubted sanctity, which it is impossible to explain. We take this to be one of the most remarkable triumphs of impartiality.

But after all it is impossible to read these volumes without a feeling of wonder, without catching something of the author's fire and kindling into an enthusiasm which carries one almost beyond oneself. To say of them, as is sometimes said, that they read like a novel, would be a great injustice: not merely, if we mean by "a novel" what is too often meant in our day—a string of impossible crimes and outrages related in bad and pompous English—but even comparing them with the noblest specimens of fiction. For while it is as difficult to lay down the book as if it were a masterpiece of Scott or Thackeray, there is still the difference which S. Ignatius ob-

\* L'impartialité consiste à être juste, non pas à être neutre.

served in the very beginning of his conversion, between the effect left upon his mind by the romances of chivalry (to which he had been so much devoted), and by the lives of the Saints; the one leaves behind it something of dissatisfaction and disturbance, the other only peace and joy.

It is remarkable that a subject so specially English should have fallen to the lot of a French author. Possibly all the facts in these volumes are to be found in one or other English book, but we certainly know of none in which they are brought out with anything approaching to the same beauty and prominence. One after another the saints and heroes of England's earliest days stand out in the light of the author's genius, as some verdant meadow, some castle or cathedral tower is thrown out, when, amid surrounding clouds and gloom, an exceptional gleam of sunlight falls upon it—

Just as the lingering sun has touch'd with gold,  
Far o'er the cedar shade some tower of giants old.

It is impossible not to feel that England—regarded by foreigners, not without too much cause, merely as a vast hive of manufacturing industry and commercial wealth—owes much to a writer who paints with so much beauty and truth, in a foreign tongue, accessible to all the readers of Europe, these men—truly great, because (to adopt the Hebrew expression) “great before the Lord”—whose very names, though they have never faded before Him, have for centuries waxed dim, and have now been long utterly lost from the memory of men—*caruere quia vate sacro*. And yet history has preserved the record of very few men in themselves so admirable and so great in their achievements.

It is impossible to believe that there has been in any European nation a group of men so well deserving to be remembered and honoured, and yet so utterly forgotten, as S. Columba, S. Wilfrid, S. Bennet Biscop, and their compeers; or, let us add, such women as S. Etheldreda, S. Hilda, and the long line of royal abbesses who figure in these volumes. It is inconceivable that if such persons had ever existed elsewhere, all record of them would have perished. And yet even that would have been less wonderful than what has happened in England, for their names have been all but forgotten, while there still existed, as the Count de Montalembert has so well proved, chiefly in the works of the illustrious Bede, but also in many other documents which have lately been brought to light, abundant materials for their history.

In fact the almost total oblivion of these great English worthies has resulted from a curious combination of circum-



stances. With regard to England itself, it is of course the change of religion in the sixteenth century which has chiefly swept away their memory. "The Arabs," we read, "have a fable that the great Pyramid was built by antediluvian kings, and alone of all the works of men bore the weight of the flood." Thus they account for the existence of so huge a pile, while not only has its use wholly ceased, but the very memory of the purposes for which it was built has been swept away. Not more utterly could the work of S. Augustin, S. Wilfrid, and the rest have perished from their beloved England, if the whole race of which they were the benefactors, the instructors—we had almost written the founders—had been totally swept from its soil. Our author truly says, "In modern England all that Wilfrid did has been destroyed, all that he loved has perished." Not more utterly ignorant is the wandering bandit of Mesopotamia in our day of the notions and worship of those who reared the giant piles of Nineveh and Babylon, than is the English peasant—nay, the English merchant—nay, the mass of those who are called educated men—of the religion and Church for which these heroes of his name lived and laboured, and were ready to die. "Of the long and touching popularity" of S. Wilfrid, says our author, there remains only a shadow—a name—an empty word. In the modern city of Ripon, which had its origin simply in the monastery founded by him, the country people have preserved the custom of calling a certain Sunday of the year "Wilfrid Sunday." But if they are asked why, it too soon appears that they know nothing either of the life of the Saint to whom they owe their existence as a city, nor of the Church of which he was the apostle and champion. The fact is that in Catholic countries the memories of the Saints have been preserved among the people by devotion, and the circumstances of their lives by the yearly preaching on their festivals. The Catholic Saints are forgotten in England because England has ceased to be Catholic. This fact is well worth the notice of those Anglicans who would fain persuade themselves that their religion and their Church are, after all, the same as those of the great Saxon Saints. If so, the memory of them would have been as much preserved as that of Whitfield or Wesley. Anglicans had no need to establish a devotion for them among their people, for they found it deeply rooted. All they had to do was to prevent its dying away. What they did was to root it up. Englishmen care nothing about their greatest benefactors because they regard them as the blinded tools and victims of a false and mischievous superstition. The Apostles of other nations are remembered with affectionate

gratitude, because the religion which they taught is known to be the greatest of all the blessings given by God to man.

To a certain extent, this effect has, perhaps, been increased by the Norman conquest. It has taught Englishmen to begin their history with the reign of William the Conqueror; and many in our day are hardly conscious that the English nation and the English language existed long before it. Of this there could hardly be a stronger proof than their strange habit of calling the language spoken by their forefathers eight hundred years ago, not English, but Anglo-Saxon. Again, the kings of the House of Plantagenet insolently reckoned the number of the English kings as if they had begun with the Normans. Still they did not speak, as we now do, of Edward I., but of Edward "since the Conquest the first,"\* and although the devotion to the Saxon Saints may have been diminished among the higher classes by their Norman traditions, it could hardly fail to be increased among the conquered and oppressed population, which after all was the stock of the existing English nation. Our author shows how much this was the case with regard to S. Wilfrid. S. Cuthbert, again, was even more strongly remembered.

Near four centuries after his death this veneration and the confidence which he inspired in the population round Hexham, expressed itself in a touching and truly poetical legend. Malcolm, king of Scots, in one of his many cruel incursions into England, enraged by the murder of his messengers in the neighbourhood of Hexham, had given orders that the town should be sacked and all the inhabitants massacred. The Picts of Galloway, the most savage of the Scotch, were charged with the execution of this atrocity, only too much in keeping with the customs of the times. The tears and lamentations of the doomed victims had been as powerless to move the king as the intercession of the clergy. In the night before the day fixed for the massacre, the whole population, unarmed and despairing, had taken refuge in the church of S. Wilfrid, which echoed with their cries and groans. One of the principal priests of the town, having fallen asleep from exhaustion, had a dream, in which he saw two bishops arrive on horseback from the South. These Christian diocuri arrived full speed to announce to the wretched inhabitants of Hexham that they were saved. "I am Wilfrid," said one, "and this is Cuthbert, whom I have brought with me as I passed by Durham. We come together to deliver you. I

\* Sir Harris Nicholas mentions that "Edward the First is sometimes called Edward the Fourth, the three Saxon monarchs who bore the name being reckoned. The copy of the 'Chronicle of Lanercost,' written in the 14th century, is headed in some pages 'Edwardus I. post Conquest,' in others 'Edward Rex I.,' and in another page 'Edwardus iij<sup>ius</sup>.' The Chronicle thus notices the birth of Edward the Second:—"A.D. 1283, Eodem anno natus est Edwardus quintus filius Edwardi Quarti apud Karnawan." A copy of Tivet's "Chronicle" in the British Museum adopts the same computation.



have heard the weeping and groans of those who prayed in my church. Have no more fear. At daybreak I will stretch my net over the whole course of the Tyne, and none shall be able to cross the river to do you harm." In fact, early in the morning the valley was covered by an impenetrable fog. The emissaries of the king lost their way, and when the fog dispersed, the Tyne had so much swelled that (there being no bridge) the Scotch were unable to cross it. In this the husband of S. Margaret saw the finger of God, and renounced his bloody purpose. The inhabitants of Hexham remained more convinced than ever that the arm of Wilfrid was always stretched out to protect them.

But it was above all at Ripon, where his relics reposed, that this universal confidence was seen. There was a concourse thither from all quarters, as if there the aged Saint had still been to be found, who had never feared anything or any man; who was invoked, and whose protection was demanded with blind confidence and tender familiarity against the outrages of conquest, the abuses of power, and the unjust severity of the law.

Fifty years after the deliverance of Hexham, the Scotch, under their king, Saint David, again invaded Northumbria, and committed horrors seldom equalled even in the wars of that period, horrible as they were. The terrified population flew to arms, led by the Archbishop of York and the Anglo-Norman barons, the most celebrated for the munificence which they had displayed since the restoration of monasticism in the twelfth century—the Bruces, the Mowbrays, the Percies, the Estoutevilles. They marched against the cruel invaders and met them some distance north of Ripon. The English were drawn up around a wagon, which resembled that famous *carroccio* which the Lombards of the same period took to battle against the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa. Upon this, beneath the ciborium which held the consecrated Host, was planted the banner of S. Wilfrid—*Wilfridi Ripensis vexillum*—between those of S. Peter and S. John.\* This wagon which was called "the Standard," gave its name to the battle, in which the King of Scots and his savage army were totally routed. After the victory, the banner of the Saint who had thus protected and saved the diocese he had ruled, was borne back to Ripon in triumph, often to be displayed again at the head of the battalions in arms for the defence of the land (vol. iv. p. 376).

The day of Agincourt, Oct. 25, was solemnly kept in France, in honour of S. Crispin and S. Crispinian, martyred in Gaul under Maximian. In the north of England it was, as the Count de Montalembert mentions, specially dedicated to S. John of Beverley, whose relics were translated on that day. Shakespeare perhaps judged that a king of the House of Anjou would remember the French martyrs rather than the English bishop, or possibly the Northumbrian Saint may not

---

\* S. John of Beverley, also one of the great heroes of these volumes. The church of Ripon was dedicated to S. Peter.

have been specially honoured in Mercia, and he may not have known of the day ; else it seems hardly possible that he should have omitted to mention S. John, when he makes King Henry say—

This day is call'd the feast of Crispian.  
 He that outlives this day, and comes safe home,  
 Will stand a tip-toe when this day is named,  
 And rouse him at the name of Crispian.  
 He that shall live this day, and see old age,  
 Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbours,  
 And say, to-morrow is S. Crispian :  
 Then he will strip his sleeve, and show his scars.

Be this as it may, Henry did not forget the Saxon Saint ; for our author mentions that six years afterwards he went to offer thanks for the victory at the shrine of S. John of Beverley (vol. v. p. 165).

The banner of S. Cuthbert was borne before the Nevilles and the Percies in the "pilgrimage of Grace, the glorious but fatal rising of the Northumbrian people against the atrocious tyranny of Henry VIII." (vol. iv. p. 444), and was burned by order of the tyrant amid the general massacre which followed its suppression.

These and many other indications seem to prove that the influence of the Norman conquest in lessening the devotion of the English people to the early Saxons of their nation has been, to say the least, much over-estimated. That they are little known on the Continent is not wonderful, when they have been forgotten here. The general unpopularity of England, nay, the uncouth Saxon names, hard even to our tongues, would unite to produce the effect,\* and those whose writings and words should have kept up their memory were silent, for they had forgotten them.

In England there has, of course, been a reaction within the last twenty years. The memory of S. Wilfrid especially has been restored by the devotion of the beloved and lamented Father Faber, himself a Northumbrian, who took his name in religion, and who, even before he was himself a Catholic, had

---

\* Our author says :—"It must be confessed that the confusion which reigns through all this early history of the Anglo-Saxons is cruelly aggravated by their fancy for giving to all the children of a family names almost identical. Thus, in the dynasty of the kings of Northumbria Oswald, Oswy, Oswin, Oswulf, Osred, Osric, Ostrytha—in that of the kings of Essex Sebert, Sigebert, Sigehere, Sigeherd—in that of the kings of Wessex, Ceawlin, Ceolric, Ceolwulf, Ceadwalla—in that of the kings of Mercia, Penda and Peada, &c. This custom was not confined to the Royal families. The Bishop Ceadda (St. Chad) had three brothers ; Cedd, Cælin, and Cywnbill, all like himself, monks."—(Vol. iv. p. 147, note).

published a life of the Saint, to which the Count de Montalembert frequently refers, and which has, no doubt, produced a great effect. It is owing to this work, no doubt, that the name of Wilfrid, which had become quite obsolete, has been so much restored, that in Catholic colleges in England there is a confusion among the boys who bear it.\* Like everything which came from his pen, it is full of beauties, but truth compels us to add that it is not what it would have been had it been written for Catholics after the author was a Catholic. No doubt it was on this very account better fitted for the work it had to do. But those whose hearts were stirred by it in their days of transition, and who look back at it now, are apt to complain that much of it is rather an apology for devotion to Rome than the spontaneous outpouring of a heart which already rested in that devotion. It certainly does not in any degree render needless the labours of the M. de Montalembert in the fourth volume of the work before us.

But deep as is the debt which Catholic England owes to M. de Montalembert for his vindication of her early glories, there are some passages in this work concerning England which no Catholic can read without pain and a certain sense of shame; and it is not of their severity or their candour that he will complain. English literature has not been negligent from the earliest times in producing sonorous panegyrics of the British national character; but of all that has been done in this branch of art, the picture with which M. de Montalembert commences his third volume stands far ahead. The elaborate splendour of the language, and its eager heat, which however does not always produce the effect of complete earnestness, nevertheless forbid the suspicion that it was in any degree contemplated as a caricature. Yet the least shade more of colouring would make it a caricature. Never was the sublime as perfectly preserved at so startling a risk of the ridiculous as in this paradoxical picture of a nation, to which are assigned all the pagan attributes of ancient Rome, which is admitted to be the *fons et mater* of modern heresies, and finally declared to be the most religious of all European nations, and at all events more religious than any European Roman Catholic nation.

In modern Europe, at a distance of seven leagues from France, within sight of our northern shores, there exists a nation whose empire is more vast

---

\* Thus Father Faber has fulfilled the words of his own hymn :—

“ Wilfrid, by thy sweet name  
Our little ones we call ;  
Oh then, on them and us,  
Let thy rich blessing fall.”

than that of Alexander or the Cæsars, and which is at once the freest and most powerful, the richest and most manly, the boldest and best regulated in the world. No other nation offers so instructive a study, so original an aspect, or contrasts so remarkable. At once liberal and intolerant, pious and inhuman, loving order and serenity as much as noise and commotion, it unites a superstitious respect for the letter of the law with the most unlimited practice of individual freedom. Busied more than any other in all the arts of peace, yet nevertheless invincible in war, and sometimes rushing into it with frantic passion—too often destitute of enthusiasm, but incapable of failure—it ignores the very idea of discouragement or effeminacy. Sometimes it measures its profits and caprices as by the yard, sometimes it takes fire for a disinterested idea or passion. More changeable than any in its affections and judgments, but almost always capable of restraining and stopping itself in time, it is endowed at once with an originating power which falters at nothing, and with a perseverance which nothing can overthrow. Greedy of conquests and discoveries, it rushes to the extremities of the earth, yet returns more enamoured than ever of the domestic hearth, more jealous of securing its dignity and everlasting duration. The implacable enemy of bondage, it is the voluntary slave of tradition, of discipline freely accepted, or of a prejudice transmitted from its fathers. No nation has been more frequently conquered; none has succeeded better in absorbing and transforming its conquerors. In no other country has Catholicism been persecuted with more sanguinary zeal; at the present moment none seems more hostile to the Church, and at the same time none has greater need of her care; none has been so greatly needed by her; none has left within her breast a void so irreparable; and nowhere has a more generous hospitality been lavished upon our bishops, our priests, and our religious in exile. Inaccessible to modern storms, this island has been an inviolable asylum for our exiled fathers and princes, not less than for our most violent enemies.

The sometimes savage egotism of these islanders, and their too often cynical indifference to the sufferings and bondage of others, ought not to make us forget that there, more than anywhere else, man belongs to himself and governs himself. It is there that the nobility of our nature has developed all its splendour and attained its highest level. It is there that the generous passion of independence, united to the genius of association and the constant practice of self-government, have produced those miracles of fierce energy, of dauntless vigour, and obstinate heroism, which have triumphed over seas and climates, time and distance, nature and tyranny, exciting the perpetual envy of all nations, and among the English themselves a proud enthusiasm.

Loving freedom for itself, and loving nothing without freedom, this nation owes nothing to her kings, who have been of importance only by her and for her. Upon herself alone weighs the formidable responsibility of her history. After enduring, as much or more than any European nation, the horrors of political and religious despotism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, she has been the first and the only one among them to free herself from oppression for ever. Re-established in her ancient rights, her proud and steadfast nature has forbidden her since then to give up into any hands what-

soever, her rights and destinies, her interests and free will. She is able to decide and act for herself, governing, elevating, and inspiring her great men, instead of being seduced or led astray by them, or worked upon for their advantage. This English race has inherited the pride as well as the grandeur of that Roman people of which it is the rival and the heir; I mean the true Romans of the Republic, not the base Romans subjugated by Augustus. Like the Romans towards their tributaries, it has shown itself ferocious and rapacious to Ireland, inflicting upon its victim, even down to recent times, that bondage and degradation which it repudiates with horror for itself. Like ancient Rome, often hated, and too often worthy of hate, it inspires its most favourable judges rather with admiration than with love. But, happier than Rome, after a thousand years and more, it is still young and fruitful. A slow, obscure, but uninterrupted progress has created for England an inexhaustible reservoir of strength and life. In her veins the sap swells high to-day, and will swell to-morrow. Happier than Rome, in spite of a thousand false conclusions, a thousand excesses, a thousand stains, she is of all the modern races, and of all Christian nations, the one which has best preserved the three fundamental bases of every society which is worthy of man—the spirit of freedom, the spirit of family, and the spirit of religion.

How, then, did this nation, in which a perfectly pagan pride survives and triumphs, and which has nevertheless remained, even in the bosom of error, the most religious of all European nations, become Christian? How and by what means did Christianity strike root so indestructibly in her soil? This is surely a question of radical interest among the greatest questions of history, and one which assumes new importance and interest when it is considered that upon the conversion of England has depended, and still depends, the conversion of so many millions of souls. English Christianity has been the cradle of Christianity in Germany; from the depths of Germany, missionaries formed by the Anglo-Saxons have carried the faith into Scandinavia and among the Slaves; and even at the present time, either by the fruitful expansion of Irish orthodoxy or by the obstinate zeal of Protestant propagandism, Christian societies, which speak English and live like Englishmen, are daily coming into being throughout North America, in the two Indies, in immense Australia, and in the Isles of the Pacific. The Christianity of nearly half of the world flows, or will flow, from the fountain which first burst forth upon British soil.

It is possible to answer this fundamental question with the closest precision. No country in the world has received the Christian faith more directly from the Church of Rome, or more exclusively by the ministration of monks.

Much is of course suggested by the comparison of the Roman Empire and the British, and whenever a historian may arise capable of contrasting the conquest and government of India and Ireland with the conquest and government of Gaul and Spain, we fear the honour will rest with the heathen and not with the heretic state. We know that Rome not only con-

quered, but reconciled, civilized, and enriched her subjects ; we know that England, as a conqueror, generally begins by destroying an old civilization, and takes no pains to replace it with a new ; and that wherever she establishes a colony, its first effect is to exterminate the aboriginal population. The only exception to this rule, of which we are aware, is Canada, where the humanity of the French and Irish settlers has secured an efficient protectorate for the Indians. Finally, the one undisguised object of England in the acquisition of empire has been the pursuit of gain, whether in the form of plunder, revenue, or trade ; and her whole history testifies that, provided a conquest *pays*, it is free to remain in the densest ignorance or the grossest idolatry undisturbed.

The statement that England is "the most religious of all European nations" is simply incomprehensible in any sense of the word. "This," M. de Montalembert adds in a note, "may be considered a surprising statement. It expresses, however, a conviction founded upon personal comparisons and studies made during nearly forty years in all the countries of Europe, except Russia. It agrees, besides, with the results ascertained by one of the most conscientious and clear-sighted observers of our time, M. Le Play." This surely is the Anglo-mania, with a vengeance. We have examined M. Le Play's remarkable book, but have failed to find in it any "ascertained results" to warrant so strong a statement. M. Le Play appears to be as much struck as M. de Montalembert by certain public manifestations of "religiosity" to which the English are prone: He is amazed to find a Kensington Exhibition opened with public prayers. He observes with interest the efforts of the English rural clergy. He ascribes a degree of morality to the mass of the population for which he offers no proof. All the proof indeed is the other way. Take, for example, the evidence of Mr. Kay. There can be no higher authority. As Travelling Bachelor of the University of Cambridge, he was expressly appointed to observe the moral and intellectual conditions of the populations of the Continent, and to compare them with that of England. His conclusions have never been refuted, never even disputed. Let us weigh his words alongside of M. de Montalembert's:—

The poor of England [Mr. Kay says] are more depressed, more pauperized, more numerous in comparison to the other classes, *more irreligious*, and very much worse educated, than the poor of any other European nation, solely excepting Russia, Turkey, South Italy, Portugal, and Spain.



Again he says :—

The great majority of the people in the great towns of this kingdom have no religion. They are not fitted for the reception of Protestantism, or if they are in a few cases, it is for a corrupted and corrupting phase of it ; and we have taken from them the only religion capable of influencing them in their present state.

And again :—

The very worst feature of our English towns is the condition of a great part of their juvenile population. Certainly there is nothing like it throughout the countries I am going to mention.

As to the religious condition of the English rural population, after giving a number of "ascertained results," which we dare not reprint here, he says that their ordinary habit of life tends—

To destroy the modesty and virtue of the women, to annihilate the foundations on which we build all the national and domestic virtues, and to make want of chastity before marriage, and want of delicacy and purity after marriage, common characteristics of the mothers and wives of our labouring population.

We still quote the same writer :—

About one half of our poor can neither read nor write, have never been in any school, and know little or positively nothing of the doctrines of the Christian religion, of moral duties, or of any higher pleasures than beer or spirit drinking and the grossest sensual indulgence. Even of the small shop-keeping and farmer classes, there are great numbers who can neither read nor write, and who have never even entered a Sunday-school. . . . None of all this class ever search the Scriptures for themselves ; few of them care to give their children any instruction. . . . They live precisely like brutes to gratify, as far as their means allow, the appetites of their uncultivated bodies, and they die to go they have never cared, thought, or wondered whither.

These statements are not the morbid fancies of some frenzied Anglo-phobe or bigoted Ultramontane. They are the deliberate verdict of one of the most generally accepted authorities, who is besides a sincere Protestant ; and they are established by incontrovertible evidence. They simply sum up or anticipate the result of a vast mass of Parliamentary inquiries, such as Lord Ashley's Commission, the Poor Law Reports, Mr. Horace Mann's Religious Census, the Children's Employment Commission, the evidence taken before several Commissions and Select Committees on Education ; and the only answer that can be conceived to the case made is that England, as a nation, is not represented by the majority of its population, but by its characteristic class, its supposed governing class, the middle class. Tested by the

Divorce Court and the Stock Exchange, that class will hardly do much to substantiate the character of England as the most religious nation in Europe. It is the class in which the *Saturday Review* says "Chastity is a dead virtue." It is the class of which the *Spectator*, the ablest of the organs of the middle class, said a fortnight ago:—

There cannot be a doubt that the master vice of the middle class, we had almost written their master passion, is thieving. We doubt if a race ever existed among whom pecuniary dishonesty was so general, or so deeply affected the structure of society. We consider ourselves a virtuous people, the salt of the earth, and it is not too much to say that at this moment the basis of half our laws, the cause of half or more than half our administrative weakness, the root of three-fourths of our commercial difficulties, is the well-founded belief; that a middle-class Englishman, if he gets anything like a chance, will steal, will expend his brain, his time, and his energies in able efforts to steal money which is not his.

And the proofs of this statement are just as strong, and as accessible in an authentic form as are those of Mr. Kay.

Yet M. de Montalembert cannot be said to be altogether ignorant of the spiritual darkness of England. More than once he describes it in words mournfully and painfully powerful. His mistake is in supposing that it is so localized and so exceptional. It is not a question of the latent religious instincts of the people, or the "organized hypocrisy" of their public opinion. He refers to ascertained results, to comparisons of statistical observers with other countries. We believe, and so do the most impartial English observers, that the burden of evidence is altogether the other way; and we think it is a cruelty, such being the case, to set up the English as a model of morality and religion to Catholic nations, and thus lead them to conclude that heresy can produce results which the Church is powerless to effect. How the English nation would have sustained a comparison in religion and morality with other Christian nations, had it remained Catholic, it is not for us to imagine. It might—perhaps would have been—as great in grace as in nature. But, assuredly, this sketch of Northumbria is sadly nearer to the truth of England's actual spiritual condition than the glowing picture we have just quoted—though the truth itself lies between them:—

The black night of idolatry which covered Northumbria before the Saints, predecessors and contemporaries of Bede, has been replaced by the black night of manufactures. The coal trade has transformed the face of the country, and the day is literally darkened by the thick columns and heavy clouds of smoke, incessantly poured forth by the factories and mills which the inexhaustible mineral wealth of the land supports. Newcastle, North



and South Shields, Sunderland, Stockton, Darlington, Hull, all these centres of the consumption and exportation of coal, have replaced in men's attention and esteem the ancient monastic nurseries of faith and Christian civilization, Lindisfarne and Yarrow, Tynningham and Wearmouth, Hartlepool and Whitby. What a contrast even to those who do not look below the surface, between the aspect of old and now. The coal so much valued has clothed this fair land with a mourning veil. It has stained the verdure of the woods and fields. It has polluted the limpid waters. It has infected the purity of the air. It has intercepted the brightness of the sun. Everything compels us to believe that all this is only a type of the moral darkness within, in which is struggling that immense and terrible population which seeths in these craters of British commerce. The awful density of those unknown and impenetrable masses covers over abysses of ignorance, of vice, of misery, and of rage. Paganism has come back. In spite of generous efforts, partial remedies, and honourable exceptions, and in spite of the observance of the rest of the Lord's Day required by law and respected, the love of gain has created hosts of the slaves of toil, tools without souls, but already, with ravenous, but too much reason, for a better lot, a less bitter condition than that the continuation and aggravation of which must strike terror into the heart of every Christian and every patriot.

The light of the faith and the moral law are more utterly wanting than even the light of day. Buried alive in mines and factories, without Prelates, without spiritual guides, a prey to everything of disorder, of excess, of forgetfulness that can accompany labour in company, almost all of them strangers to the thought of God, to the hope of a life to come, to habits of modesty: victims and instruments of the worship of Mammon, they are there as a perpetual menace addressed to the blind mechanical egotism of our age.

No man admires more than I the prodigies of human intelligence and activity which the genius of the English race has realized—no man renders a more sincere homage to its instincts naturally and unconquerably religious. But in this district, once so fruitful in sanctuaries of prayer, of virtue, and of moral and intellectual life, how is it possible to witness without alarm religious indifference and an insatiable thirst of riches almost everywhere replacing the anxious care of the Church for souls? How be otherwise than alarmed, at the abandonment, the spiritual destitution in which so many thousands of our fellow men are living? How fail to regret those days when the fervour and docility of the people answered so well to the zeal, the learning, the disinterestedness of the clergy; when, like the light-houses, which upon the tops of the promontories, at the mouths of the rivers, or on the edge of the reefs, hold forth a light for the safety of those who navigate that coast, so full of dangers and so much frequented: so did year after year see lighted up bright gleams of life intellectual and moral, laborious and pure, doing good and well ordered, upon that shore, then so much deserted, unknown, thinly peopled by a few savages—at Lindisfarne as at Yarrow, at Whitby as at Coldingham, at Wearmouth as at Tynemouth.

A day may perhaps come—God grant it be not too long delayed—when, in the midst of the marvels and perils of modern activity, new hearths

of charity, of light, and peace may be kindled like so many beacons to guide and draw souls in their pilgrimage towards eternal life (vol. v., p. 101).

We must not forget that "the monks of the West" are our author's subject, and that "the conversion of England" only comes in because it was by the labours of the monks that England was converted. The first of the three volumes, after speaking of Christianity among the Britons, and of its almost total destruction by the Saxon conquest, describes the state of the island between 450 and 550 A.D., at the very time when S. Benedict was "planting on Mount Cassino the nursery of the greatest of religious orders." Britain presented the spectacle of four races in furious contest. There were first the original Britons on the whole western coast opposite to Ireland, occupying the three peninsulas of Cornwall, Wales, and Cumberland. They were Celtic Christians.

Next; in the northern part of Scotland, beyond the great line of mountains which runs from the peninsula of Cantire on the west to the neighbourhood of Aberdeen on the east, were the Picts, a Celtic tribe, originally akin to the Britons, and believed to be the same called by the Romans Caledonians. They were still heathen, and in the deepest barbarism. Another branch of this nation occupied the country between the Clyde, the Forth, and the Solway.

Between these two branches of the Picts were the Scots, a Celtic tribe, originally emigrants from Ireland into Scotland, where they are supposed to have settled about the year 258, and therefore before the period when Britain was *infested*, as the phrase was, by the incursions of the united Picts and Scots. They were also heathen.\* The name Scotia at this time still meant Ireland; and the name Scotti or Scoti was still applied to the Irish Celts, although not to the exclusion of the branch of the nation settled in Caledonia. The name Dalriadians was applied in the same manner to a portion of both. Lastly, the rest of England was occupied by the Anglo-Saxons, also heathens, divided into eight petty kingdoms, and proceeding from several different German tribes, nearly related in blood, habits, and institutions—the Saxons, Angles, Jutes, &c.

Whence was the light of the gospel to come to the heathen Saxons in England, and to the Picts and Scots of Caledonia? It is sad, but no way wonderful, that the Christian Britons

---

\* Our author does discuss the endless controversy as to the origin and nationality of the Picts and Scots, but gives, without any doubt, as the conclusion to which he arrives, the result we have here briefly stated.

refused to have any share in the conversion of their neighbours the Saxons. They had poured down upon Britain likewild beasts. The war between them and the natives had been, and indeed still was, one of extermination on both sides, and the Britons of Wales and Cornwall no more thought of them as possible Christians than they did of the wolves by which the island was still infested. Such is human nature that even saintly men shared this feeling. The British monk S. Beino, who had founded a community on the west bank of the Severn, which divided the two nations, heard a hunter cheering on his dogs in the English language on the other side of the river. He called to his community: "Quick—take your habits and your shoes and let us be gone, for that man's nation speaks a language foreign and abominable to me. They are come to invade us and dispossess us for ever." There is a legend that he sowed an acorn over the grave of his father which grew into a great tree, and that every Englishman who approached it died on the spot, while it was safe to a Briton. All this was hardly blameable, but so long did the feeling last, that long after the English had become Christians, and when they were still in the saintly fervour of their new Christianity, the Britons in Wales, and those left in the conquered provinces (if any there were?) refused to regard or treat them as anything but heathens. The venerable Bede expressly witnesses: "Even to this very day" (he died in A.D. 735, 108 years after the baptism of the first Christian king of Northumbria, and when Northumbria had produced many great saints) "it is the custom of the Britons to esteem as nothing the faith and religion of the English, and not in anything to communicate with them more than with heathens." Cadwallon, the Christian king of Wales, and friend of S. Beuno, not only joined with the heathen Saxons of Mercia in invading the Christian kingdom of Northumbria, but avowed his intention of exterminating the Northumbrians; and, as far as lay in his power, carried out the intention by a long series of bloody massacres.

S. Gregory the Great expressly declares that the British priests who bordered on the English heathens, not only neglected their conversion, but "refused to answer their desires when they wished to be converted to the Faith of Christ."

From the Celts in Wales there was nothing to be hoped. Happily the Celts in Ireland, who had been converted by S. Patrick a century before, were wholly free from this un-Christian hate. These volumes everywhere show them receiving English visitors with the utmost hospitality, and imparting to

them not Christianity alone, but education and civilization, as well as protection from their domestic enemies.

From among them was to come the first apostle of Great Britain, the great S. Columba, who settled upon the island of Iona in the fifth century. The island of Iona is now visited by many times more Englishmen in a single summer than it was in the thousand years between 700 and 1700 A.D. Those who have not seen it will find a good account of its present state in a book by Messrs. Bucklers, architects, at Oxford.\* The island, two miles and a half in length, and one in breadth, lies close to the Island of Mull. Like the neighbouring isles, it is now totally bare, but in the time of S. Columba was clothed with a forest. The ruins which still remain are of a date long after S. Columba, except perhaps some of the crosses, of which there were formerly three hundred and sixty, and two or three of which remain, although only one perfect. It was made by S. Columba, not only a residence of saints, but a sort of University. Englishmen of the highest rank, in the seventh century, left their country for years to study at Iona, and that even when they had evidently no intention of becoming monks. Thus Alfrid, king of Northumbria from 685 to 705, had spent many years there in study, and he was only one of many kings, and Tanists, Thaness, and Maormors who did the same.

The character of S. Columba by M. de Montalembert is a masterpiece of historical reconstruction, and a model of biographical portraiture. A perfect sympathy of spirit has enabled him to penetrate the mists of fifteen centuries, and to realise the studies, the sorrows, the labours of the great exiled Abbot of Iona, who loved Ireland (always excepting its princes) so passionately, and whose name is still hardly less potent than S. Patrick's with his people. M. de Montalembert has lately detached this splendid episode from his history and published it separately; and we propose

---

\* "The Cathedral and Abbey Church of Iona." Day & Son, Gate Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, 1866. It is a pity that this useful and beautiful book is disfigured by the addition of "an account of the early Celtic Church by the Right Rev. the Bishop of Argyll and the Isles," in which Dr. Ewing (who adopts this swelling title, although he has neither the confidence of those who inhabit Argyll and the Isles, like the Presbyterian ministers, nor the mission of the Church, nor even, like the English bishops, that of the Queen) retails (together with many of the facts of S. Columba's life) all the absurd fictions with which Anglican controversialists have encrusted it. In spite of the Doctor, however, the work of the architects is highly to be praised and recommended; and Dr. Ewing's nonsense, while it gives him a good deal of pleasure, will probably do no one any harm.

to follow his example in reviewing it. Were we to turn to S. Columba now, our space would be too inadequate to consider our author's general subject at all.

It is plain that the great Abbot of Iona did not share the systematic repulsion of the British priesthood for the Saxon race. The most authentic accounts of his history make express mention of Saxon monks admitted by him into the community at Iona. One of them, who acted as baker, was reckoned as his intimate friend. But nothing intimates that these Saxons enrolled under the authority of S. Columba in any way reacted upon their countrymen. On the contrary, while the Scoto-British missionaries spread through every part of Caledonia, while Columba and his disciples kindled the light of the Gospel in the Northern regions, where it had never before penetrated, in the centre of the island, which had been Christian under the Romans, the Christian faith, and the Catholic Church crushed under the ruins thrown down in heaps by the Saxon conquest, was ever sinking more and more. Paganism and barbarism, vanquished by the Gospel on the high lands of the North, triumphed once more in the South. . . . In 586 the two last bishops of conquered Britain, those of London and York, abandoned their churches and took refuge among the mountains of Wales, carrying with them whatever consecrated vessels and relics of the Saints they had succeeded in saving from the rapacity of the heathen (vol. iii. p. 329).

In this noble field the successors of S. Columba were to labour to do good service, and win bright crowns in Heaven; but it was not the will of God that by them the "door of faith" should first be opened to the English nation. It was in our island at the end of the sixth century as it had been in Syria five centuries and a half before. S. Paul was made the Apostle of the Gentiles, but it was not given to him to put his hand to the work until the door had first been opened by him to whom the keys of the kingdom of Heaven had been given by the Son of God Himself. Then the completion of the work which he had begun was intrusted to other hands. As he himself said, looking back after the work of S. Paul had made great progress, "You know that in former days God made choice among us, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel and believe." And so it was here. Others were to carry on the work; by Peter alone it was to be begun when S. Columba returned his soul to God, June 9, 597. And some months before, S. Augustine, the Monk of the Benedictine community founded on the Cœlian Hill by Gregory the Great, had landed on the Isle of Thanet, in the name and with the mission of the Prince of the Apostles. It is hard to restrain oneself from once again going over the immortal history of the Northumbrian boys in the slave-market at Rome, and how they were bought into freedom by

the Abbot Gregory; how he wished to go himself as the Apostle of their nation, how he was retained by the Roman people; how, when seated in the Chair of S. Peter, he sent his friend and successor on the Cœlian to fill the place for which he had longed; how the forty Benedictines made the toilsome and dangerous journey through France, going (whether as the safer route, or because the geography was imperfectly known) by the banks of the Loire through Anjou; how their hearts failed them at the danger of the undertaking, and how they were encouraged by the letter of S. Gregory—"Better never to have undertaken this good work than, after undertaking it, to give it up; forward, in the name of God: the more suffering here, the more glory in eternity;" how they landed in the Isle of Thanet; their interview with the king, who held supremacy over all Saxon England; how they went into Canterbury singing in procession, invoking with litanies the mercy of God on the city; how the king and his people were baptized, and the royal palace made the site of the new church, on the spot where the Cathedral still stands; which, though desecrated for three hundred years, was for near one thousand the focus of Gospel light, the fulcrum on which worked the mighty arm of Peter in England. S. Gregory rejoiced that another nation had been added to the Church, and, in a letter which has come down to us, called upon the Patriarch of Alexandria to rejoice with him. Ethelbert, the first Christian king in England, was baptized on the Feast of Pentecost three months before S. Columba died.

There are days of beauty at the opening of all grand enterprises. They do not last—thanks to the lamentable and incurable infirmity of things human! But it is important that they should never be forgotten and always honoured. These are the spring-flowers of beautiful lives. History has no work more important than that of bringing to us their perfume. The church at Canterbury, in the course of a thousand years, knew glories without an equal. No church in the world, after the Church of Rome, has been governed by more great men, or has fought more glorious fights. But in all her annals of glory nothing has eclipsed the sweet and pure light of that humble cradle, of that *cénacle*, in which a handful of strangers, Italian monks, protected by the generous hospitality of a king, an honourable man, and guided by the inspiration of the greatest of the Popes, laboured in prayer, abstinence, and toil to conquer the ancestors of a great nation to God, to virtue, and to the truth (vol. iii. p. 366).

These spring days were not soiled by any interference of the convert king with the freewill of his subjects. "It was not to unite England to the Roman Church, but to divide it from her a thousand years later, that a different king and



different Apostles had to make use of executions and fires." The joy of the Holy Pope was without alloy. "He did not, indeed, foresee the great men, the great Saints, the immense resources, the indomitable champions which England was to furnish to the Catholic Church; but it was also his happiness not to know of the falling away which was one day to take away the crown from so many glories, and the base ingratitude which has dared to deny or explain away the incomparable benefit conferred by him and his emissaries upon the English people, by bringing them into the light of the Gospel."

From Canterbury the beacon fire was caught by London and Rochester, in both of which sees and cathedrals were founded, which lasted till England fell away. The cathedral of Rochester was dedicated to S. Andrew, the Patron Saint of the Benedictine House on Mount Coelius (although that has long changed its name in honour of its founder, S. Gregory); that of London, after the Apostle of the Gentiles. The great Abbey, founded by S. Augustine outside the walls of Canterbury, which was dedicated in honour of S. Peter and S. Paul, in like manner, has ever since borne his own name. Saint Pancras also became a favourite dedication in England, because the property of S. Gregory's family, on Mount Coelius, on which he had founded the house whence the Apostles of England went out, had of old time belonged to the family of that young martyr. So close was the relation between the Church of England and Rome.

Where, then, is the Englishman worthy of the name who can look from the Palatine towards the Coliseum, and see before him without emotion or without remorse that little spot of earth from which came to him the faith and the Christian name, the Bible upon which he so much boasts himself, the Church itself of which he has preserved the phantom? Here it was that the enslaved children of his ancestors were received and rescued. Upon these stones knelt those who made his country Christian. Under that roof the grand design was conceived by a holy soul, offered to God, blessed by God, accepted and accomplished by humble noble-hearted Christians. Down these steps went the forty monks who bore to England the Word of God, the light of the Gospel, Catholic unity, the Apostolical succession, and the rule of S. Benedict. No country ever received the gift of salvation so immediately from popes and monks; and, alas! none so soon and so cruelly betrayed them (vol. iii. p. 353).

The venerable Bede has preserved to us the precious correspondence between S. Gregory and S. Augustine at which Hume sneers. Among other valuable gifts, he sent a collection of books, the catalogue of which, as it was kept for ages

afterwards at Canterbury, ended with the words, "This was the origin of the Library of the Church of England."

These spring days were marked by miracles so great and wonderful that S. Gregory tells the Egyptian patriarch that "the miracles of the Apostles were renewed in those of S. Augustine and his companions. What is a still stronger proof of their reality is that he cautions the Apostle of England against pride; "miracles have been wrought by the reprobate, and we know not whether we ourselves are of the number of the elect." Yet in the case of Augustine the joy which he has given to the angels is a strong assurance to S. Gregory: "*peccator ego spem certissimam teneo.*" Our author quotes a passage from Burke (by the way, he loves to call that illustrious son of Ireland "the greatest of Englishmen") showing that he believed the reality of these miracles.

A Protestant paper which reviewed the work before us said that it might have been valuable, but that the author was obliged by his position to believe all the miracles related, and therefore it is of no value. And, although this is merely a delusion, it cannot be denied that Catholics who know that miracles take place in every age must look upon history in a very different light from those who believe, either that they never happened, or that they were confined to the times of the Apostles. But it is equally true that a very large proportion indeed of the miracles recorded in the history before us would not be admitted as proved, at Rome, in a process of canonization. What is essential is that those who record them should write in good faith; and of this we have not a doubt. Before the Church can regard a miracle as certainly proved, she requires, of course, much more. The fact is that the companions and contemporaries of S. Columba and S. Cuthbert (as our author well observes) took supernatural events very much as a matter of course. Speaking of the appearance of S. Cuthbert for the deliverance of mariners in danger, he says:—"It came into no one's head in those days to doubt the reality of such apparitions. To the men of those times, all over Christendom, nothing was more natural than the supernatural. It was only the Almighty power of God interposing more frequently or more directly. It might alarm or might console, but never surprised them." In part this habit of mind, no doubt, came from their being less acquainted than we with second causes. They attributed the daily rising and setting of the sun to the direct action of God, and they could do no more if it had stood still as in the days of Joshua. That there is more of truth and reason in the modern habit of mind, which practically assumes that all the common events of



the world for which we can discover second causes, happen without the intervention of God; the first feeling of which, therefore, is to try to account for any unusual event without His intervention, and which would think it something utterly astounding if it was forced to believe that in any individual instance He had interfered, we utterly deny. Of course the ancient habit of mind led people easily to regard as miracles many events which we should only call "*gratias*." But it is equally true that the habit of mind which felt that nothing was more natural than the supernatural would never have arisen if many supernatural events had not happened. The result is, as far as regards our own state of mind in reading these histories, that we are perfectly aware they are in most cases recorded by persons who saw no need for continually examining the evidence; who may, therefore, in many cases, have mistaken *gratias* or even mere natural events for miracles, but who, no doubt, were in perfectly good faith in what they recorded, and we have neither the power nor the need to decide in every instance whether what they took for a miracle was so or not.

Nothing, however, can be more absurd than to wish that an historian should leave out these narratives. He has to describe times and persons as they were, and to attempt to cut off all that either was or was believed to be miraculous would be to change the history into a fable. To return to our history. In the spring of the year 605 S. Gregory went to his rest, and was followed two months later by S. Augustine. And now the scene changes to the kingdom of Northumbria. It was originally two petty kingdoms, Deira, nearly the same as Yorkshire, and Bernicia, including Durham and Northumberland. The royal houses of the two were closely allied by marriage, but it happened that some member of one or other usually obtained possession of both, and the rival family were in exile, so that Northumbria came to be considered as one kingdom, and the Saxon confederacy was called a "*heptarchy*." We know in much more detail the history of this kingdom than that of any other, because the venerable Bede was born, lived, and died on the banks of the Tyne. Edwin, who had been brought up an exile, became king of Northumbria eleven years after the death of S. Augustine, in 616, and extended his power to the Forth, on which he founded the city called after his own name, Edinburgh. In most histories he is little more than a name. The Count de Montalembert brings him out before us in all his doubts and hesitation about the new religion, which was professed by his wife, Ethelburga, daughter of the first Christian king of Kent, and was preached to him by her confessor Paulinus,

Roman monk from Canterbury. "The history of the Church, I believe, affords no other example of a hesitation so long and conscientious on the part of a pagan king. They seem equally quick, whether to persecute or to be converted. Edwin, as he is represented to us on unquestionable testimony, experienced all the humble struggles, the delicate scruples of a modern conscience." When he had settled his own mind and gathered his Parliament to consider the question, it was to him that the well-known and memorable answer was made by one of his chiefs, "Oh king, when you are at supper on a winter evening with your earldomen and thanes, and the fire blazes bright in the midst, a bird will sometimes fly swiftly through the house, coming in at one side and out at the other. For the moment it is sheltered from the storm and rain; but then it is seen no more. It comes out of the winter, and returns to the winter. Such seems to me the life of man, and his passage for a moment between that which goes before and that which follows. If, then, this new doctrine can teach us anything certain, it is well that we should follow it." The kingdom of Northumbria became Christian, and such multitudes thronged to be baptized by Paulinus that one part of the river Derwent received from it the name of Jordan, which it still keeps. From Northumbria Paulinus penetrated into East Anglia, where he founded churches at *Lincoln* and *Southwell*, which are represented by glorious buildings of later date remaining to our day. It seemed that the conversion of England was to be completed by the Roman monks. But such was not the will of God. Mercia had an aged heathen king indignant at his neighbours for their change of religion. He attacked Edwin and the Northumbrians in concert with the Christian king of the West Britons. Edwin fell in battle after a reign of seventeen years, and the new Christianity of the North was totally crushed. He was succeeded in his two kingdoms by two kinsmen who had been baptized, but who fell away. And thus thirty-six years after the arrival of S. Augustine Christianity seemed quite lost everywhere in England beyond the petty kingdom of Kent. Paulinus was driven out of the North, and died Bishop of Rochester; the Christian queen of Northumbria took refuge in France.

Twelve years passed, and the religious position of England was still unchanged; Christianity was in possession in Kent. Then Oswald, the descendant of "the man of fire" and "the ravager," as the founders of the Bernician dynasty had been called by the Britons, returned from an exile of many years among the Christians of Scotland with twelve companions of his exile Christians like himself, and raised the Northumbrians

against their enemies, defeated and killed the British king, Cadwallon, close to the wall of Severus at a place which still bears his name, and obtained supremacy over the whole of England. His first care was to obtain an Irish missionary, Aidan, from Iona, who established his see, not at York, where Paulinus had sat, but on the island of Lindisfarne, which became the centre of the Celtic mission in the North. With these Oswald personally laboured, acting as interpreter to the foreign bishop. After a reign of only seven years he was killed in battle, resisting the unprovoked invasion of his country by Penda, the terrible heathen king of Mercia.

So died, at eight-and-thirty, Oswald, whom the Church counts among her martyrs, and the Anglo-Saxon people among the Saints and heroes of most enduring popularity. Through the darkness of this difficult and confused period the eye delights to rest upon this young Prince, educated in exile among the hereditary foes of his race, consoled for the loss of a throne by his conversion to the Christian faith, regaining by his sword the kingdom of his fathers, planting the first cross upon the native soil which he came to free, then, crowned by the love and devotion of the people to whom he had given peace and supreme truth by risking his life in charity, united for a few years to a wife whom he had brought to Christianity by wedding her, gentle and strong, serious and sincere, pious and intelligent, humble and fearless, active and refined, a soldier and a missionary, a sovereign and a martyr, dying in the flower of his age on the field of battle, while fighting for his country and praying for his subjects.\* Where in history shall we find a hero more ideal, more accomplished, more worthy of eternal memory, and, it must be added, more totally forgotten? But it was long before this forgetfulness buried him. Through the whole Anglo-Saxon period, and even after the Norman conquest down to the Plantagenets, this valiant Christian, this great king, this generous Englishman continued to be the object of popular veneration. The chroniclers and poets of the time vie in boasting of his glory; the monks of the great and magnificent church of Hexham went in procession year by year to celebrate his anniversary upon the site of the cross which he had planted with his own hands, on the eve of his first victory. But the love and gratitude of the Christian people consecrated with even greater celebrity the place of his defeat and death. Pilgrims used to flock in crowds to seek relief from maladies and to relate on their return the miraculous cures they had obtained. As to his bones, they were an object of veneration, not only among all the Saxons and Britons of Great Britain, but beyond sea in Ireland; nay, among the Greeks and the Germans (vol. iv. p. 33).

His head and hands were cut off and placed on a stake by the heathen conqueror; they were secured and kept as relics until the sacrilege of Henry VIII. But many of our

---

\* His last words as he fell were, "O God, have mercy upon souls;" and Bede says that it became a proverb among the English to use these words, with the addition, "as Oswald said as he was falling to the earth."

readers are aware that S. Cuthbert is always represented bearing in his arms the head of S. Oswald. This refers to the special veneration of the Saintly bishop for the martyr king, and to the fact that the head of S. Oswald was always kept in the same case with the uncorrupt body of S. Cuthbert, and no doubt they are still together awaiting the time when they can safely be restored to Catholic veneration. The "Bollandists" (tom. ii., August., p. 85) prove that his hand was preserved as late as the sixteenth century.

The kingdom of Northumbria was restored by Oswy, brother to the martyr, whose reign, eight-and-twenty years in length, and of the greatest prosperity, would be in all respects glorious if it were not tainted at its beginning by the death of a rival in the kingdom of Deira, which (if we are not misinformed of the particulars) our author is justified in pronouncing a murder. This reign was marked by the defeat of the heathen Penda who was killed in the field, aged eighty years, after having killed five Anglo-Saxon kings. His special animosity was against Christianity, which now spread from Northumberland chiefly by the labours of monks, Irish by descent and often by birth, but coming from Iona, Lindisfarne, and Melrose. Our author thus sums up:—

If we sum up the efforts made for the conversion of England during the seventy years between the landing of Augustine and the death of Penda, we shall see—that of the eight kingdoms of the Anglo-Saxon Confederacy, that of Kent alone was won and preserved solely by monks from Rome. That their first attempts among the East Saxons and the Northumbrians ended in a check. The West Saxons and East Angles of Wessex and East Anglia were converted by the combined action of Continental missionaries and Celtic monks. The two Northumbrian kingdoms and Essex and Mercia, making together more than two-thirds of the territory occupied by the German conquerors, owed their final conversion exclusively to the peaceful invasion of Celtic monks, who not only rivalled the zeal of the Roman monks, but after the first obstacles were surmounted, showed much more perseverance, and obtained much greater success (vol. iv. p. 128).

The kingdom of Sussex alone remained heathen. For the details we must refer our readers to the work before us, where they are beautifully related. But the point of greatest importance is that all the missionaries, whether bishops or priests, were monks—either Benedictines from Rome or followers of S. Columba from Iona. Of course the natural, nay, necessary result of this was that the foundation and endowment of great religious communities rather than that of parish churches was the form which Christian piety and munificence naturally took in England. At first crosses instead of churches were erected

in the country villages in which there were not monasteries, and when, at a later period, clergy were settled in the villages, the custom arose of giving the name of "monastery" to what would be called in France the Presbytery, even although it was the home of only a single priest, for Englishmen could not think of a missionary or Apostolic priest except as a monk. Our author says that every English bishop before the Conquest was a monk; and hence arose the custom, peculiar to England, that many cathedrals, as those of Canterbury and Winchester, were founded in monasteries; and the bishop was elected, not by canons (as elsewhere), but by the monks, whose head he was. The first thirty-eight Archbishops of Canterbury were Benedictines. It is a notion common among English Protestants of our day that there is something in the monkish system peculiarly repugnant to the English character. Our author, as we have seen, takes a view absolutely opposite, and, indeed, it would follow from his conviction (which he shares with all the scholars and historians of the continent) that the present English people are, almost without change, the Anglo-Saxons of old. For, whatever else may be doubted, the singular and overpowering attraction of the life in community for the English of the seventh and eighth centuries cannot be and never has been disputed. It was not merely that kings and queens delighted to found monasteries; they were so attracted towards them, that their people, who (resembling, as our author says, their modern descendants) could neither bear to submit implicitly to their kings nor to do without kings of the old royal family, complained that the royal families would come to an end, owing to the number of them who became monks and nuns. Sometimes in a moment of invasion the people would throng to a monastery and compel some devoted monk who had once been their king to leave the cloister for the time, and put himself once more at their head in the field. So it was with Sigebert of East Anglia, "not only a great Christian, and for his times a man of great learning, but also a great warrior. Wearied of the strife and unrest of earthly sovereignty, he declared that he would no longer employ himself upon any kingdom save in Heaven, nor fight except for the Eternal King. He caused his hair to be cut, and entered, as a religious, the monastery which he had given his Celtic friend, the Irishman, S. Fursy." But his kingdom was invaded by the terrible heathen, Penda, and his British allies; Sigebert, in spite of his resistance, was forced to put himself at the head of his Angles. He refused to bear a sword, but went to battle with them staff in hand. "His devotion was in vain. All he could do was to die for his faith and for his country. Staff in

hand, the king-monk fell at the head of his countrymen by the sword of the heathen enemy;" and this man had been born and educated a heathen, and had spent years of his life as a worshipper of Woden.

There was perhaps no one of the royal lines which boasted of their descent from Woden which did not give to the Church monarchs as monks. Ina, king of Wessex, was a great legislator, whose code has lately been published by the British Government. He was a brave and victorious warrior, and added the Celtic kingdom of Cornwall to that of the West Saxons.

After thirty years' reign in prosperity and glory, and at the height of his power and popularity, his queen, Ethelburga, sprung like him from the warrior Cerdic, and who had been the sharer of all the cares of his life, even fighting victoriously in his absence at the head of his followers, persuaded him to renounce the throne and the world. A great festivity, with all the lordly refinements of the luxury of the age, had been given in one of the royal domains. Next morning the king and queen left it, but having ridden an hour or two, she begged her husband to return. He consented, but on entering the palace he was struck with wonder to find the scene of yesterday's festivities not only silent and deserted, but in disorder and dirt. Everywhere was rubbish and litter, and on the very bed on which they had slept was stretched a sow with her farrow. The astonished king questioned with a look the queen, who had given secret orders to the intendant of the domain. "Ah, my lord and husband," said Ethelburga, "where are our joys of yesterday—where our hangings of purple, our boasting, petulant flatterers, our plate of massive silver, our delicate viands! All have passed away like smoke, and those who attach themselves to such things will pass away like them. See, I beseech you, the misery destined for this flesh which we pamper so delicately. And we, who fare more richly than other men, shall we not also turn to corruption more wretchedly than they?" (vol. v., p. 136).

Ina called together a Parliament, and declared his intention of abdicating the throne, and spending the rest of his years in penitence and prayer. Then, accompanied by Ethelburga, he made the pilgrimage to Rome. Arriving there, after a long and weary journey, one account says that he entered the monastic state under the rule of S. Benedict; another, that he preferred, from humility, to remain undistinguished from the crowd of poor pilgrims, without the tonsure or the monastic habit, gaining his bread by the labour of his hands.\*

---

\* "*Dux femina facti*," adds the monastic historian, William of Malmesbury, captivated and imbued, like all of his class, with the memoirs of classical antiquity.



On the left bank of the Tiber (then nearly desert), not far from the Vatican, the king and legislator founded an establishment destined to give an orthodox education to the young princes, the priests, and the clerics of his country who desired to finish their religious and literary education under the shadow of the basilica of S. Peter. To this he added a church and cemetery specially destined for his countrymen, and there he was himself buried ; for he died at Rome in the obscurity which he had voluntarily sought. His faithful Ethelburga remained by him to his death, and then returned to become a religious in England (vol. v., p. 139).

These volumes are full of narratives of beauty and wisdom like this, with the advantage of being historical. We only regret the necessity of turning them out of the beautiful and eloquent French of the Count de Montalembert into such English as we can give. If we are to judge of our own success by that of most translators from French into English, he will hardly know his own work. We must add that the foundation of Ina has lasted, with different modifications, to our own day, and, after sending to our country we know not how many martyrs in the days of persecution, still continues to furnish to the Church a number of English priests, for the English college and the Collegio Pio occupy its site. The church, which was destroyed by the revolutionary armies of France, out of hatred to England, is now being rebuilt. The work of the pilgrim king Ina and his queen is thus going on even in our own day, and he and she are doubtless still prayed for by those who receive the benefit of their foundation.

Another peculiarity of the early Christians of England, closely connected, no doubt, with their conversion by the monks, is to be found in the number of princesses of royal houses who became religious, and in many instances founders and abbesses of great houses. Such was, among the first, Etheldreda, the queen of Edwy, and afterwards abbess and founder of the religious house, and through that of the city and Episcopal See of Ely. She was an East Anglican princess, and had been married to a chief whose domains lay on the marsh land between the East Angles and the Mercians. He endowed her with wide lands, and when at a later period she sought to conceal herself from the pursuit of the Northumbrian king, she raised a house on a sort of island of firm land in the midst of the fens, which obtained its name from the multitude of eels—which were, in fact, all—that it produced. The great abbey of Whitby, whose noble ruins still look down from their cliff upon the storms of the North Sea, was long one of the most important centres of religion and civilization in the North of England. It was founded by one of the most



distinguished of these royal nuns, S. Hilda. She was of the family of the kings of Deira, granddaughter of that Ella, the heathen king whose name S. Gregory had heard from the children in the Roman slave market. She was born in exile, during the time that Ethelfrid, "the Ravager," son to the "Man of Fire," had added her native county to Bernicia. In 617 she was restored, when her uncle Edwin recovered the throne, and was baptized with him, while still a child, by the Roman bishop Paulinus. She lived, says Venerable Bede, three-and-thirty years "right nobly" in the midst of her fellow-citizens and her kindred. Then, feeling the call of God, she resolved to go into one of the French houses of nuns, but was detained in England by the authority of the Celtic-British Aidan, who placed her over a community which had been founded a few years before at Hartlepool, the first superior of which (herself also a Northumbrian, named Heia) had been the first of the English princesses who took the religious habit. Hence S. Hilda removed to Whitby, "of all the sites," says our author, "chosen by monastic founders the grandest and most picturesque, after that of Mount Cassino, and in some respects, owing to the immediate neighbourhood of the sea, even more imposing than that chief seat of the Benedictine order." Here she ruled until her death in 680, after thirty-three years of monastic life. It is hardly too much to say that no one person of her day exercised an influence so wide and so deep as S. Hilda. The power of women, which was noticed by Tacitus as one of the characteristics of the Teutonic race, was nowhere stronger than in England; and when England became Christian, the influence of royal maidens dedicated to God—"Goddess brydes," as they were called—was as great, often greater, than that of queens themselves. Whitby was one of those houses which included a community of monks, as well as one of nuns, under the authority of the same abbess. This was not an unnatural development of the feudal system, for when a great lady was mistress of the soil and at the same time a religious superior, it was quite in accordance with the ideas of the times that the monks who settled on her estate should become "her men." The arrangement was, in the earliest times, common in England, and no scandal seems ever to have been caused by it. It was not quite confined to England, having been adopted in several houses in France, and retained in one of the most celebrated, Fontevrault, down to the great Revolution. S. Hilda held a situation of such high importance that, in the life of S. Wilfrid, we find her on an important occasion sending an emissary to Rome, who is mentioned with

those sent by the King and the Archbishop of Canterbury as a person quite as important.

The monastery she ruled became quite a seminary of priests, and, indeed, of bishops. From it went forth many prelates as remarkable for their virtues as for their learning. Bede mentions by name six whom he especially praises. Above all, one of the number, S. John of Beverley, attained a degree of popularity rare even in England, where in Saints were former days so universally and so easily popular (vol. iv., p. 68).

But Whitby was even more remarkable by the fact that in its monastery, while under the cross of S. Hilda, lived and died the monk Cædmon, whose poetical works are read and admired to this day by the few who have the key to the ancient English language in which they are written. Sir Francis Palgrave says that some passages in his poem on the "Revolt of Satan" are so much like "Paradise Lost" that they might seem to have been translated, word for word, by Milton a thousand years later. Unfortunately for us, as Bede says, speaking of these very works, "Poems, however admirable, cannot be translated from one language to another without great injury to their beauty and majesty," and the works of our countryman are therefore practically lost. M. Taine, remarking the singular resemblance of the two English poets, says—

It is thus that true poetry springs up; it repeats, over and over again, some passionate word. We have here the songs of the once servant of Odin, tonsured now and wrapped in monastic habit. The poetry remains the same. The Satan of Milton is in the Satan of Cædmon as a picture is in the cartoon, and the reason is that both of them have their pictures in the race. Cædmon found his subject in the warriors of the North as Milton did his in the Puritans.

What is remarkable is that Cædmon was only the herd of the abbey farm to a comparatively advanced period of life. Song was then almost indispensable in the festivities of the English as well as the Celts. Cædmon had no music. He passed the harp when it came to him at a feast, and went apart in solitude. One evening, thus alone, he went and lay down to sleep among his cattle. In his sleep he heard a voice saying, "Cædmon! sing me something." "I cannot," he replied, "and that is why I have left the feast and come here." "And yet sing," said the voice again. "What shall I sing?" "Sing the beginning of the world—the creation." Upon this Cædmon, in his dreams,

Set himself to sing *impromptu* verses, in which he celebrated the glory of the Creator—the Eternal God—the Author of all wonderful works—the

Father of the human race, who gave to the sons of men the heaven for their roof and the earth for their habitation. When he awoke he remembered all that he had sung in his dream, and went to tell it to his master in the farm.

What had happened to the herd came to the ears of S. Hilda, who caused him to be admitted into the monastery, and thenceforward his wonderful talent for poetry was developed. It was one instance more in which the institutions of the Church called out and trained natural talents which, if they had been given in our day to a person in the same class of life, would have been hopelessly crushed by the stern necessity of labouring for his daily bread. "Many Englishmen since," writes Venerable Bede, "have tried to write sacred poetry, but none of them has ever equalled the man who had none but God as his teacher."

He was [says our author] first of all a simple Christian—a true monk, and, to say all in one word, a saint. His soul was full of sweetness, humility, simplicity and purity. He served God with a devotion full of calmness and thankfulness for the extraordinary grace which had been given him. But, full of zeal for monastic regularity, he kindled up against those who transgressed the rule with a zeal so full of wrath that he seems to have felt some scruples on this subject in the article of death. He would never put in verse subjects frivolous or worldly. He composed poems only to be of use to souls, and their grave beauty ministered even more to the conversion than to the delight of his countrymen. He excited many souls to a contempt of the world and an ardent love of the heavenly life (vol. iv., p. 73).

What we have said, imperfectly as it reproduces the effect of the volumes before us, is enough to show that it was no mere accident that England was converted by monks; that it was not merely that the missionaries bore a particular name, and wore a special habit, but that the whole Christianity of the nation, for many centuries, really received its mould and form from that fact. It is not one of the least points of resemblance of the ancient English to their children in our day that an institution so justly and so dearly loved by the nation at large was made the occasion (to use a very modern phrase, but one which expresses a very old thing) of a job. Venerable Bede complains that, besides the real monasteries, in his day there were a great number of what he calls "false monasteries." The lands given to monasteries were exempted from many public burdens which fell upon other property. Some rich men, therefore, bethought them of the notable plan of founding a monastery, so called, of which they made themselves nominally abbots, although seculars and married men, or sometimes their wives abbesses. Sometimes they

took in, to preserve appearances, a few monks—ill-conditioned men, who had been turned out of real monasteries. The state of the law, it seems, enabled them not only to retain the lands thus nominally given away, but to leave them to their heirs. Bede loudly demands a reform of this evil, which he said so much weakened the State that, in case of invasion, it would not be able to resist. When it was reformed we believe is not known. It is certain that nothing is heard of this grievance in later times. Possibly it was put a stop to in one of the Anglo-Saxon councils. Nothing could show more strongly than such an abuse the popularity of the monastic orders with men of all classes in England. It is pleasing to find that this abuse, great as was the head to which it had attained before the death of Bede, had not begun till after the watchful eye of S. Wilfrid was closed in death.

And to that great Saint we must now return. His was a difficult and most important work, and well he did it. The conversion of the greater part of England, as we have seen, had been wrought out by noble-hearted devoted monks from Iona, and they had naturally introduced among their converts what are called the Celtic usages. Nothing in the history of those times has given occasion to so many controversies as this. The Anglican divines, whose peculiarity it is that, while essentially Protestant, they are anxious not to appear to be separated from the ancient Church, are of course bent upon proving that the monks and missionaries of Iona were Protestants—in fact that they were Anglicans. This is exactly a parallel instance to what Macaulay remarks with regard to English historians. Frenchmen, he says, can study and write the history of France under the Merovingian and Carlovingian kings with impartiality, because the revolutions which have followed have so completely severed the unity of the nation that it is of no practical importance whether or not any particular institution existed a thousand, five hundred, or even two hundred years ago. But all English writers are bent upon showing that the ancient constitution of England was either Whig or Tory, and consequently history has been written by Englishmen in the spirit of a political pamphlet, because to see things as they really were, would be to admit that the constitution and practices which they defend are really not ancient but modern. So it is among writers of ecclesiastical history. German Protestants, as the Count de Montalembert shows, laugh at the attempt to deny that S. Patrick, S. Columba, and S. Aidan were what is now called Roman Catholics, and neither more nor less. The fact is, that nothing but the extreme of prejudice could have suggested to any one

to deny it ; and this is a subject about which German Protestants are free from prejudice, because their system being avowedly founded upon private judgment, and setting aside the tradition of the Church, it is really no loss to them to admit that certain holy men in a secluded part of Europe in the sixth and seventh centuries were what it is admitted all the great Saints and great lights of their day unquestionably were. But no prejudice can be stronger than that which induces Anglican writers to look anywhere and everywhere to find somebody who may be called Catholic without Rome. Hence they have called the Albigenses their own spiritual fathers ; although, if they could only look fairly at the case, they would see that they are doing themselves foul injustice, for those same Albigenses were something of a cross between an ancient Manichee and a modern Jacobin. Fancy poor respectable Dr. Longley the successor of so truculent a monster ! It would indeed be something if they could find themselves successors to Saints so highly and so justly venerated as Columba, Aidan, and Colman, and such vast benefactors of the English nation. Unfortunately, then as now, those who were not Roman, were too manifestly not Catholic—those who were Catholic were too manifestly Roman. The matter hardly needed demonstration, and it has been demonstrated as clearly as any historical fact can ; yet Anglicans go on repeating what everybody else sees to have been disproved, and no doubt will go on repeating it as long as they are Anglicans. Whenever that painful necessity ceases to press upon them they will wonder at their own past blindness. For instance, Dr. Todd, of Trinity College, Dublin, although really one of the most learned men of the day, has persuaded himself that S. Patrick was a Protestant. No wonder the same nonsense was repeated by a highly respectable Irish Protestant peer in the House of Lords in a recent debate. Dr. Ewing, whose additions to the valuable work of Messrs. Buckler on the antiquities of Iona we have already mentioned, repeats all the nonsense about the Oriental origin of Irish Christianity, about its never having been in communion with Rome, &c., just as if it had not been a hundred times refuted.

The volumes before us not only give a learned refutation of all these pretences much more carefully than they deserve, but they do much more ; they set before us a living picture of the men whom Protestants thus claim, and certainly that picture is one which no one could mistake. Borchart found pictures of unmistakable Jews in the paintings in the tombs of the old Pharaohs. This would have been proof enough

that the painting celebrated the conquest of Jerusalem, even if it had been possible that the inscription, "Roboam, King of the Jews," had been erroneously read. And certainly no man could gaze on the beautiful and life-like painting of S. Columba in the Count de Montalembert's third volume, or that of S. Aidan or S. Chad in the fourth, and doubt that these men were what our Protestant countrymen in the present day would call "rank Papists."

Still, great and saintly as these men were, there was a great deal to be set right in their practice—a great deal which, if it had not been set right, might have led in the result to very serious evils, and it was to the correction of these things that S. Wilfrid devoted his life. To take the chief point: men who (as an able and candid writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* this year avowed to be the case with himself) feel and live just the same on Easter-day and Good Friday—who neither feel any special gladness in Easter, nor any special solemnity in the Holy Week—such men may very naturally sneer at the earnestness with which Saints on both sides discussed the question as to the day on which Easter should be kept. But the early English Christians were otherwise minded. To them the Holy Week, and especially Good Friday, were really solemn beyond all power of human description. It would be very greatly to understate the case, if we said they felt like those who have a most dear friend dying or dead in the house. Easter-day was the triumph of Him who loved them and whom they loved, and the assurance of their own Resurrection in and with Him. What must it have been, then, when in one house the husband was keeping the feast of Easter, while the wife, professing the same Faith and partaking of the same Sacraments, was passing through Palm Sunday and the days of the Holy Week? Could it be doubted that if the difference were allowed to continue and become fixed it would, of necessity, have ended in a schism? The other points, especially the tonsure, were in themselves less important; yet in those days, when matters of Ritual were much more prized than they are now, they might very easily have ended in serious evil. Above all, if the customs of the Celtic monasteries were to be maintained against the general practice of the Church, there was evident and most serious danger that the principle of Church authority would in time have been disregarded, and that England would have had a national not a Catholic Church. No loss could have been more dreadful to England—to the Church at large it would have been most serious.

And yet nothing could have been more innocent than the origin of the Celtic custom, while their obstinacy in adhering



to the rules which had been handed down to them by those who originally brought them into the Church, if it led them into an error, was in itself commendable. The mistake about Easter is clearly explained by our author. The Celtic missionaries were not Quarto-decimarians, as seems to have been imagined, at the time, by many who followed as well as by many who objected to their practices; for they observed Easter upon the Sunday following the fourteenth day of the lunar month. In this they followed the decree of the great Council of Nice, which ordered that Easter should be kept on the Sunday following the full moon which comes next after March 21. But in fixing the full moons, the Christians of those days followed a Jewish calendar which was not exactly correct, and the result was that in many years Easter fell a week too soon. The mistake was originally corrected at Alexandria. The Roman Church after a time adopted the correction, which is called the calendar of Dionysius exiguus. But this happened after the conversion of Ireland by Saint Patrick and before the mission of Saint Augustine to England. St. Patrick therefore (as in duty bound), introduced into Ireland the Roman use as it was in his day; St. Augustine that in use in his day. And the Saxon conquest, which cut off the Celtic churches from intercourse with the rest of Christendom, prevented them from becoming aware of the difference, until it was presented to them as the national custom of the Anglo-Saxons, a race whom they had only too much cause to detest, and who were just entering the Church of which they themselves had long been zealous members.

Neither, it is to be remembered, had the Celtic Catholics ever been required by any authority to alter their customs. By the very fact of calling upon the Britons of Wales to unite in teaching Christianity to the English, Saint Augustine showed that he regarded them as sound in doctrine. For in these days the system so widely adopted by our Protestant friends, that men at war among themselves as to what the Gospel is, should unite to preach the Gospel to the heathen, had assuredly not been dreamed of by any one. In fact, their error was an astronomical one, and Rome showed that wonderful moderation and largeness of heart which has ever been one of her most striking characters, in not condemning their practice, but leaving them to correct it when they found what it implied.

And thus the matter actually ended. In the beginning of this fifth volume, our author has a chapter on "The End of the Celtic Difference." One after another the Celtic churches



abandoned the erroneous calculation. No doubt many loyal and humble hearts suffered much in the course of the change. No doubt men from whom we should have expected perfection showed that they were still imperfect. But the great end was attained. Uniformity of practice was established without a schism and without any ecclesiastical censures.

But this, humanly speaking, would never have been if S. Wilfrid had not stood in the breach. He sacrificed the whole peace and comfort of his life, but at that price he did what had to be done. He found the Celtic customs spread over nearly all England; probably the only place where they were not observed was the modern county of Kent. Had things remained as they were a little longer, the English nation would have been fixed and settled in them, some king would have enforced them in Kent, and England would have been divided from the rest of the Christian world a thousand years sooner than it was.

It can hardly be doubted, however, that these customs were closely allied to others which, though natural, perhaps laudable in their origin, were highly dangerous. The Christianity of the Celtic churches was so exclusively monastic, that both at Iona and Lindisfarne an abbot was a much higher authority than a bishop. Hence modern Scotchmen have tried to prove that they were Presbyterians, an attempt as absurd as that of Englishmen to make them Anglicans. No abbot ever dreamed of ordaining; but the bishop (when he was not also an abbot), was strictly confined to the administration of those sacraments for which episcopal orders were necessary, and seems to have been in everything else subject to the abbot, who administered all ecclesiastical affairs. This must in the end have led to fatal results if it had not been, as it was, quietly corrected by the extension to the churches founded by the Celtic missionaries of the ordinary discipline of the Church; which was the one work of S. Wilfrid's life. This state of things accounts for a strange phenomenon noticed by our author.

The modern reader cannot fail to be astonished at the total ignorance of the Anglo-Saxon Church at this period of the most elementary rules of the Canon law as to the institution and irremovable tenure of bishops. The first time, Saint Wilfrid was deprived of his See at York without any judicial sentence; indeed, before he had actually taken possession. And yet Saint Chad did not hesitate to accept his place; and at a later period neither Saint Cuthbert, S. Bosa, nor S. John of Beverley felt the least more hesitation (iv., p. 259).

All these saints had been educated in a system in which

the bishop was not esteemed to have any authority, although no one else could ordain or confirm.\*

The history of the struggle by which S. Wilfrid succeeded in changing for ever the whole character of English Christianity, is in fact the history of his long life, and is beautifully and eloquently told by our author. It occupies almost half of his fourth volume. We must resist the temptation of giving extracts, telling how at thirteen years he took horse and armour and escort from the palace of his father (apparently in Yorkshire), made intolerable by the temper of his stepmother, to the court of King Oswy; how the Queen Eanfleda, daughter of the late King Edwin (himself of Deira, *i.e.* Yorkshire), granddaughter of the first Christian king of Kent, and herself the first infant baptized in Northumbria, became his patroness, and obtained from the King permission for the young noble to enter the religious state at Lindisfarne; how happily rolled by the years of his youth in study and prayer on that sea-beaten rock! They were all the years of peace he was ever to know. The most truly wonderful step in his whole life was that when only eighteen, and not yet tonsured, he resolved to do what, in his time, no one of his countrymen had ever yet attempted, to make the pilgrimage to Rome; and set out with the full consent of the monks of Lindisfarne. Nothing, as our author remarks, could more prove their good faith, and that they had no intention of rejecting the authority of the Holy See. Then we follow him to the court of the King of Kent, where, as everywhere else, his youth and beauty and virtues won all hearts; to Lyons, where he had to resist the importunities of the saintly Archbishop to settle as the husband of his niece and lord of a sovereign principality. "I am under a vow. Like Abraham, I have left my family and my father's house to visit the Apostolic See, and there study the rules of eccle-

---

\* That S. Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, should have been a party to the transaction is much more strange. It is to be remembered that, at the end of his course, he repented of his conduct towards Wilfrid, and made all the reparation in his power. It is not the only puzzle in the conduct of that great man, the first who practically established the metropolitan authority of the See of Canterbury. A native, like S. Paul, of Tarsus in Cilicia, and habitually called even by Popes "the Philosopher and Archbishop of England;" he can hardly have been ignorant of ecclesiastical law. This makes it strange that he should have procured the passing of a canon by which the Celtic bishops were required to be re-consecrated, and that he actually enforced it, at least in the case of S. Chad. Was there any irregularity in the Celtic ordination which might suggest a doubt of the validity of their orders? We know of none. Yet it might seem to be suggested by the fact that Saint Wilfrid declined to be consecrated by them, and actually went to France for the purpose. He had before been ordained priest by a French bishop, although in England.

siastical discipline, that so I may benefit my country. But, if God gives me life, I will come back this way and see you again." These remarkable words prove that he left home with a suspicion that things were not quite as they should be in the Celtic churches, and a resolution to drink the true tradition at the fountain-head.

Little could he then know that he was devoting his whole life to a weary strife. As little was it known to the first Apostles when they heard by the Lake of Galilee the voice that bade them "*follow Me.*" But who so blessed as they who early hear and obey the call, "*Go ye also into my vineyard.*" The particulars can never be better told than they have been by our author, and we must not spoil his glorious narrative by the vain attempt to compress it within our limits. Only let it be said, it is clear throughout the whole history that the opponents of S. Wilfrid, though quite ignorant of ecclesiastical law, and therefore frequently transgressing it, never intended to be anything else than good Catholics. Thus even when Wilfrid returned from Rome, with an order for his restoration to his See, and was thrown into prison; it was not that the Pope's authority was denied, but that he was accused of having forged the letter. If any man in our day should present an order of Pius IX., reversing a sentence of the Queen's ecclesiastical courts (for instance, in the case of Bishops Gray and Colenso) does anyone suppose that this would be the objection made to it? It is as clear that King Edwy and his peers and prelates were not, as that Queen Victoria and hers unhappily are, Protestants. It was the special glory of S. Wilfrid that, even when driven from his proper post, he was made an instrument of blessings to countless thousands. Once he is driven to the coast of Friesland, and converts to christianity the heathen king and his people;\* another time he brings into the church the kingdom of Sussex, the last remainder of heathenism in England, and founds the bishopric of Selsey, afterwards removed to Chichester. Again and again he goes to Rome.

How many contrasts to his first journey thither, when the young protégé of Queen Eanfleda travelled with all the spring of twenty, towards the Eternal City. Now he is seventy: for forty years he has been a bishop, but a bishop plundered, driven for the third time from his See, misunderstood, persecuted, calumniated, not by profligates and tyrants alone, but by his brethren in the Episcopate, by his superior in the hierarchy, by his countrymen. The aged saints, the aged kings, the gracious and saintly queens,

\* It is very remarkable that he seems to have found no need of an interpreter. Nothing supernatural is said to have been observed. It would appear, therefore, that the language of the Saxons in England and on the Continent had not yet become divided.

who encouraged him when he set off in the apostolic life, all are gone. And with them so many friends, so many companions-in-arms, so many pupils snatched away prematurely from his paternal hopes. It is not only the charming dreams of youth, but the generous resolutions of riper years that must give place in his mind to the sense of betrayal, of ingratitude, and of the uselessness a hundred times demonstrated, a hundred times felt, of his efforts a hundred times renewed on behalf of virtue, righteousness, and honour.

And yet he still presses on, he perseveres, he holds high his white head in the midst of the storms; he is, in his old age, as ardent, eloquent, resolved, indomitable, as in the first days of his youth. Nothing in him betrays weariness or discouragement, or sourness or even so much as sadness (vol. iv. p. 332).

His desire was to stay in Rome, to prepare for his end by penitential practices, and thence to depart home. But he returned to England by the command of the Pope. He knew that his labours were nearly over, and divided his worldly possessions, sending the largest of four portions as an offering to the churches of "S. Mary Major" and "S. Paul without the walls" at Rome, "whence justice and liberty have come to me." He made a solemn adieu to the community of his favourite house at Ripon. His last work was the consecration of a new abbey Church at Evesham, destined for memorable things, and he was on his road towards the North,\* when the summons to his rest reached him at Oundle, near Northampton, in a religious house of his own foundation.

After giving to his companions a last benediction, he let his head fall back upon the pillow and lay in calm repose without a groan or a sigh. The whole community were in prayer and tears around his bed. When they came to the verse of the ciii. psalm, "*emitte Spiritum Tuum et creabuntur*," his breathing ceased, and he gave back his soul to his Creator. The old soldier of God died more peacefully than an infant in the cradle. He was aged seventy-six, forty-five of which he had spent in the Episcopate (vol. iv. p. 366).

His body was carried to his beloved Ripon, and buried in the church which he had raised to S. Peter, the apostle he had so much loved.

Our author sums up with deep feeling and eloquence his services to the religious orders, to the English Church, to the Church Universal, and to England, and adds—

Wilfrid was the first of that great line of prelates, by turns apostles and politicians, men of eloquence and of battle, fearless champions of Roman unity and of the independence of the Church, high-souled representatives of the rights of conscience, of the liberties of the soul, of the spiritual might of man, and of the laws of God, a line to which history records nothing parallel

---

\* "*Omnem vitæ suæ conversationem enarravit Tatberto quadam die equitantibus per viam; quasi præsciens obitum suum.*" Our author remarks that the illustrious *Laeordaire* did the same.

outside the Catholic Church of England ; a line of saints, of heroes, of confessors, and of martyrs, which produced S. Dunstan, S. Lanfranc, S. Anselm, S. Thomas à Becket, Stephen Langton, S. Edmund the exile of Pontigny, and which ended with Reginald Pole. By a remarkable and touching coincidence it is by the side of this last Catholic Archbishop of Canterbury, in the metropolitan church sprinkled with the blood of S. Thomas the Martyr, that the ashes of S. Wilfrid rest, having been translated to the primatial church in 959 to preserve them from the rapacity of the sacrilegious Danes.

He was moreover the forerunner of the great prelates, the great monks, the prince bishops of the middle ages, the chiefs and the oracles of assemblies, the ministers and lieutenants of kings, sometimes their equals or their rivals. When duty called he was afraid of no suffering, disgusted by no privation, stopped by no danger. Four times he made the journey to Rome, then tenfold more laborious and an hundred-fold more dangerous than that to Australia in our own day. But his natural taste was for pomp, luxury, magnificence, and power. He could be humble or great as necessity demanded. He could even more easily brave kings, princes, lords, bishops, councils, parliaments, in stern and unbending defence of his power, of his authority, of his cause. \* \* \*

His influence is accounted for by the rare qualities which more than atoned for his failings. He was, before all things, a great soul, manly and resolute, ardent and enthusiastic, indomitable in energy, able now to wait and now to act, as occasion might require, incapable only of discouragement or fear ; born to inhabit the summits which attract both the gaze of the multitude and the stroke of the thunder. His eloquence, superior to anything England had then known, his quick and penetrating intelligence, his devouring zeal for literary studies and public education, his passion and skill for the construction of churches, which dazzled the eyes of Christians, and which his voice filled with such vast audiences, his strength of mind under trouble, his ardent love of righteousness, all combined to make him one of those who rule and stir the men of their times, and subdue the attention and imagination even of those whom they do not convince. He was never without something of nobility, fire, and magnanimity, which recommended him to the sympathy of generous hearts, and when adversity, violence, and triumphant ingratitude put upon his life the seal of the noble and Christian endurance of trial, a redoubled sympathy and emotion conceal every part of his conduct which might seem less attractive or less intelligible.

He was the first among the Anglo-Saxons to fix on him the eyes of other nations, the first, too, of whom a detailed biography has been preserved. In every detail, as well as in its general effect, that biography exhibits a type of the qualities and peculiarities of his nation : firmness, courage, laborious unwearied energy, obstinate love of toil, the resolution to contend to the death for his patrimony, for his honour, for his right. *Dieu et mon droit !* the lofty device of England, is written on every page of the life of Wilfrid. On behalf of a cause which, through the misery of the times and the blindness of men, has become of all causes the most unpopular in the eyes of the English nation, Wilfrid brought to bear all the virtues which belong to his countrymen and are most fitted to delight them. In him beat all the passions and all the noble instincts of his people. Hatred alone, a thousand times

more blind than ignorance, can so stupify any man as to prevent his hailing in him the eldest son of that unconquerable race, the first of Englishmen (vol. iv., p. 381).

We must deny ourselves the pleasure of following in detail several other subjects which we had marked for especial notice, and in particular the beautiful chapter upon the Anglo-Saxon Nuns, with which the third volume concludes, parts of which are doubly touching because completed in the midst of agonising maladies by a father whose most beloved child has been called into the religious state. The truth is, that if we are to quote all that is specially beautiful and attractive, we should leave out very little of the three volumes. We will therefore conclude with an extract recommended above others by its shortness :—

It would require a volume to tell the story of the devotion to S. Cuthbert and his relics, a history which cannot be separated from that of the north of England during several centuries, and which sometimes is its most important part.\* The narrative of the different journeys made by the monks of Lindisfarne in the ninth and tenth centuries to save from the Danes the body of their beloved saint, and the skull of the martyr king Oswald, form by themselves a complete Odyssey full of various and curious episodes. At last the treasure found an asylum upon a scarped platform of horseshoe shape, clothed with wood, and surrounded on three sides by a rapid river. There arose in 995 a chapel which bore the name of Durham, and to which was transferred the episcopal and abbatial see of Lindisfarne. Since that hour his name and memory brood over that magnificent cathedral of Durham, one of the most beautiful and best situated in the world. That magnificent edifice, with its three tiers of Norman windows, its two towers, its five naves, and its two transepts, together with the ancient castle of the bishops, built by William the Conqueror, form an architectural and religious whole equally admirable and little known. It can be compared only to Pisa, Toledo, Nuremberg, or Marienberg. Indeed it surpasses those celebrated places in the beautiful scenery in which the buildings are framed. It is the only example in the world of a splendid cathedral situated in the midst of an ancient forest of oaks and on the top of a rock, whose precipitous feet are bathed by a narrow rapid river.

---

\* (Note by the author.) This volume is in existence. It has been published with much care and even elegance by Mgr. Eyre, Catholic curé at Newcastle, and is entitled, "*History of Saint Cuthbert, with an Account of the Wanderings with his Body during 124 years, of the State of his Body until 1542, and of the various Monuments erected to his Memory (London, 1862).*" It has maps and plans of great utility, and contains the later history of Lindisfarne and of the cathedral of Durham. Among other curious details we find that a statue was erected to the bishop four hundred years after his death, with the inscription, "*Sanctus Cuthbertus Monachus Episcopus Lindisfarnensis nunc patronus ecclesie ac libertatis Dunelmensis.*"



## ART. II.—ARCHBISHOP MANNING ON THE CENTENARY.

*The Centenary of S. Peter and the General Council.* A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy, by HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster. London: Longmans.

OF course the one thing most important in the world is obedience to God—personal piety—the interior life: for orthodoxy itself is indissolubly mixed' up with this; and no other things are primarily important, except in their bearing on it. In one sense therefore it may be said, that those works of the Archbishop—sermons and the like—which deal directly with spirituals, are more valuable than this Pastoral. And yet it may well be the case under particular circumstances, and regard being had to the Church as a whole, that a given individual may more efficaciously forward the salvation of souls by promoting sound views on philosophy or on religious politics, than by means more directly spiritual; and this, though his command of such means be great and conspicuous. Such will especially be the case where, from name and position, he is sure of obtaining a large, attentive, and most influential audience throughout the Church, and where his powers pre-eminently adapt him for the task.

We shall not be misunderstood then, if we say that we doubt whether the Archbishop has ever published a more important production than the Pastoral before us. It is a pamphlet indeed, and not a volume; but it contains the material for many volumes. Not to speak of its other valuable contents, it comprises a most careful and well-weighed instruction, how to exhibit the Church's doctrine (1) on her own internal constitution, and (2) on her relations with the State, in the shape most accommodated to the circumstances of this time. This is a task, if we may be allowed to say so, for which the Archbishop is peculiarly fitted. The number of Catholic writers is by no means as large as could be wished, who display that undivided and unreserved loyalty to the teaching of the Holy See which he uniformly exhibits. And of these writers themselves again, there is very naturally a large proportion, who apprehend far more vividly the doctrines of the *Church* than the phenomena



of the world. It is the Archbishop's excellence, that he is faithful at once (if we may so speak) to the past and to the present. We may further add, as a minor matter, that on the present occasion he has chosen a most suitable season for his lessons: writing, as he does, under the immediate memory of the recent unparalleled Episcopal gathering,\* and in immediate anticipation of the promised Ecumenical Council.

As regards the Church's internal constitution, our author sees most clearly that the time has come—not of course for exaggeration of any kind whatever—but for stating plainly and emphatically the full extent of Pontifical prerogatives. No doctrine is so suitable to the needs of the present time, as the pure and full doctrine of the Church herself; that doctrine, which would lead a Catholic to concentrate and embody his duties to the Church, in the exhibition of unreserved docility, of zealous obedience, of loyal affection to the Holy See. When internecine war is impending between the Church and the world, it is peculiarly necessary that the Church should be at union with herself; but no unity is possible, except on the basis of authority: and the divinely-appointed centre of authority is S. Peter's Chair.† Again, to look at the same truth from another point of view—the feeling of personal loyalty is indefinitely more powerful than any attachment to an abstract principle, towards colouring the whole moral and intellectual character. Accordingly, the Archbishop puts forth some very plain language about Gallicanism; which will be new to many English ears, and which, for that very reason, was more imperatively called for. “Gallicanism,” he says,

is the Christian Judaism which strove to elect its own High Priest; the national factions which rent the Sacred College; the nationalism which set

---

\* On the absolutely unprecedented proportion of Catholic bishops assembled in Rome last June, see some remarks in our last number, pp. 528, 529.

† A remarkable article, written by some very extreme Catholic minimalist, appeared in the *Chronicle* of Oct. 5. It is no exaggeration at all to say, that its writer regards the Pope as heading and representing an anti-Catholic party within the Church. Yet his admissions are most remarkable. “There is no party” in the Church, he says, “but the Roman party. Other opinions, which are discouraged or proscribed at Rome, exist in plenty, but not in groups. There is not only neither combination nor coherence, but no substantial agreement among those who are roughly classed as Liberal Catholics.” Of course not. Never can there be permanent combination, coherence, or agreement among those Catholics who waver in their allegiance to the Holy See, so far as regards those particular tenets on which they rebel against its teaching. An admirable comment on this article appeared in the next *Westminster Gazette*.

up two or three uncanonical Popes, and two or three national obediences; the spirit of egotism, worldliness, and avarice which caused whole nations of Europe to apostatize from the Divine Will, from the unity of the Church, and to erect Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Anglicanism on the schismatical basis of national Churches.

The boldness or the unconsciousness with which Gallicanism is sometimes put forward as an opinion which Catholics *are free to hold without blame*, and as a basis on which Churches are to unite under the shelter of Bossuet, and as a standard of Catholic moderation in rebuke of Ultramontane excesses, makes it seasonable to tell its history.

In order to maintain against Innocent XI. the pretended claims of the Regale in matters of ecclesiastical benefice, Louis XIV. commanded the bishops and clergy to assemble in 1682. *Thirty-four bishops out of a hierarchy of some one hundred and twenty assembled.* A majority of these—not all, for it is known that De Brias, Archbishop of Cambray, resisted—passed the four famous Gallican Articles, and published them on the 19th of March. They were immediately condemned by the Universities of Louvain. They were assailed by the theologians of Liège. The professors of Douai at once petitioned the king that they might not be required to affirm the propositions; they declared that they and all the faithful “detested the doctrine in respect to ecclesiastical power contained in the declaration of the Gallican clergy;” they affirmed these opinions, which are destructive of the absolute primacy and infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff, to be erroneous; and that they should believe themselves to be numbered among schismatics if they were to derogate from the supreme authority of the Vicar instituted by Jesus Christ, in defining what doctrine is sound and true, and what is false and evil. “We have consulted,” they add, “the most learned theologians, both regular and secular, and we have not as yet been able to find even one solid ground to form a conscience which would dictate the lawfulness of teaching these propositions.” In Spain the Inquisition issued a decree in which each proposition was branded with a particular censure. In Hungary, in the year 1686, the propositions were condemned in the following words. After describing the four propositions as “absurd to Christian ears, simply detestable,” the plenary Council of Hungary proceeds:—“After invoking the name of God with our venerable brethren the bishops, with the abbots, provosts, chapters, and professors of theology and of the sacred canons, we condemn and proscribe the four propositions aforesaid, and we interdict and prohibit all the faithful of the kingdom from reading, retaining, much more from teaching them, until the infallible sentence of the Apostolic See, to which alone, by a divine and immutable privilege, it belongs to judge of such questions of faith, shall have been published.” Add to this, that even the theological faculty of Paris refused to accept the propositions (pp. 40–45).

The Archbishop proceeds to recite the very severe language put forth by successive Pontiffs, in reprobating the whole proceedings of the Gallican Assembly. The following is particularly remarkable:—

It is certain that the illustrious Bishop of Meaux has only escaped an explicit censure for his part in the four propositions of 1682, through the benign and paternal forbearance of the Holy See. Benedict XIV., in a letter to the Grand Inquisitor in Spain, on the subject of the works of Cardinal Henry Norris, adds:—"No doubt a work will be known to you, printed and published not many years ago, which, though it bears no author's name, all men well know to be by Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, which he had written at the command of Louis XIV., King of France, but left in manuscript in certain libraries. The whole work is taken up with asserting the propositions affirmed by the Gallican clergy in the assembly of 1682. It is difficult, indeed, to find any other work equally opposed to the doctrine, which is received everywhere out of France, concerning the infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff, when defining, *ex cathedrâ*, his superiority over Ecumenical Councils, his indirect power, if the high interests of religion and the Church require, over the supreme power of temporal princes. In the time of Clement XII. of happy memory, our immediate predecessor, *there was serious consideration of proscribing the work*; and at length it was decided to refrain from proscribing it, not only on account of the memory of an author who had deserved well in so many points respecting religion, but on account of the just fear of new dissensions" (pp. 50, 51).

Our author appends a most important catena of theologians on the condemnableness of Gallicanism (pp. 59-64), whose testimony is worthily crowned and summed up by Gonzalez. In quoting this we use our own italics and not the Archbishop's.

Therefore the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, although it is not expressly defined by the Church, is yet *proximately definable*; because it is a theological truth, altogether certain, contained in the Scriptures, and confirmed by the perpetual tradition of the Church, and the common consent of the fathers and doctors: and, as Bellarmine said, the opposite doctrine "appears altogether erroneous, and proximate to heresy, so that it might well be declared heretical by the judgment of the Church." And though it be not *de fide*, as to the obligation of believing it imposed on all by the Church, yet it is *de fide* as to its object; and also as to its obligation with regard to those who are certain, on grounds which form their conviction, that this truth is revealed: and this certainty almost all Catholic doctors have, except some few in France. But in a thing of so much weight, all are bound to examine the grounds on which rests the proof that the Roman Pontiff defining *ex cathedrâ* cannot err: for whosoever denies to the Roman Pontiff the privilege of infallibility granted to him by Christ, whether from not having diligently examined the controversy, or because he is carried away by some human motive and so errs in forming his judgment, would not be held guiltless before God; inasmuch as his error would be culpable, and his ignorance vincibile (p. 65).

It may be observed by the way, how very severely this passage speaks of those Catholics—and they are occasionally

to be found—who take for granted that it cannot be gravely culpable to disbelieve any doctrine whatever which the Church has not in so many words expressly laid down.

The position of Gallicans must at the present moment be extremely embarrassing to themselves. The Gallican tenet declares that the united teaching of Pope and bishops is infallible; but at the present moment Pope and bishops unite in teaching that the Pope, speaking as Universal Teacher, is infallible *apart* from bishops. If you start from the Gallican premiss, that the bishops are infallible when united with their head,—you are landed in the Ultramontane conclusion, that their head is also infallible when speaking alone. Under these circumstances, the same spirit which once prompted men to set up bishops against the Pope, now prompts them to set up, against both Pope *and* bishops, national traditions and what they call national character. In some extreme cases, this tendency expresses itself in language of almost direct heresy; as though the “*sensus fidelium*” were not only, as it is, a most valuable indication of the Church’s mind, but the very Rule of Faith. In July, 1866 (p. 245), we drew attention to language of this kind on the part of Mr. Oxenham. We have no wish to revive any personal controversy with that gentleman: we only mention his name to show that the existence of such a tendency is no mere creature of our imagination. By far the most common shape however, assumed by modern Gallicanism, is one on which the Archbishop comments admirably.

As to the “Teutonic element,” a few words may be said. It would seem that some suppose the Catholic Church to be a system like the Austrian or the British empire, in which *nationalities are to play their part, balanced by constitutional checks*. This Judaic notion began to rise when the idea of Catholic unity began to decline. The assimilation of all national distinctions to a higher type—the extinction, that is, of nationalities in Christ Jesus—eliminated Jew and Greek, Teuton and Latin, from the sphere of faith (p. 36).

Now nothing can be more distinct than the Church’s teaching on this subject.

This Roman Chair of the most Blessed Peter, which, being the mother and guide (*magistra*) of all Churches, has always preserved *whole and inviolate* the Faith delivered by Christ the Lord, and faithfully taught it, showing to all men the path of salvation and the doctrine of uncorrupted Truth. . . . Where Peter is, there is the Church; and Peter, through the Roman Pontiff, *furnishes truth of doctrine* (*præstat fidei veritatem*) to them that seek it. (Encyclical “*Qui Pluribus*.”) In which [Roman Church] always remains the infallible magisterium of the Faith, and in which, therefore, Apostolic Tradition has ever been preserved (Encyclical “*Nostis et nobiscum*.”) “In

which [Roman Church] alone religion has been inviolably preserved, and from which all other Churches must borrow the tradition of faith. (Bull "Ineffabilis.")

The Roman Church then, by Divine promise, ever retains unsullied purity of faith. With her, says S. Irenæus, all churches must be in agreement if they would retain doctrinal purity. Every church in Christendom retains more vividly full and true doctrinal tradition, in proportion as the influence of Rome is there more pervasive and dominant. But even among Catholics alas! there are Gallicans in heart—men who reject this doctrine. "Roman tradition," they think, "may be useful to correct the deficiencies of England, but English tradition is no less valuable in correcting the extravagances of Rome. The Church's practical teaching, as distinct from her definitions of faith, depends for its purity, not on God's promises to S. Peter's Chair, but on the free and mutually corrective admixture of conflicting elements. And by consequence the comparative absence of the Teutonic race for so many centuries has been a fruitful source of corruption as to the doctrine practically taught. The multitude of nations included in the Church—this is a chief security to which we should look, for protection against the undue influence of Rome." Such a notion simply inverts the Church's whole constitution. God teaches the Holy See, and the Holy See teaches the Church; it is Peter whose faith fails not, and who in his turn confirms his brethren: whereas, according to the above notion, he would not be simply the Church's teacher, but in part her disciple. Rome, let it never be forgotten, is commissioned to teach England and Germany, not England or Germany to teach Rome. So far as any Englishmen or Germans are at variance with what is authoritatively inculcated in Rome, they are quite certainly in error. Rome no doubt may often wish to correct her impressions of *fact* by special communication, *e.g.* with England; but she cannot, without abandoning her essential claims, seek correction from any source, on matters of doctrine or of principle.

If such deplorable opinions as those on which we have commented may be found even among Catholics, one cannot be surprised to find them in the *Saturday Review*. It was from the columns of that periodical that the Archbishop quoted the opinion which he assails; and in its number for Oct. 26th it has returned to the attack. But the writer totally misunderstands the Archbishop's point. "The Archbishop," he says, "obstinately refuses to recognize that various races, with their diversities of national character, contribute not only numerically, but dynamically to the

strength of the great whole whereof they are constituent portions."\* This proposition seems to us, as it will doubtless to our readers, not true only but axiomatic; and the Archbishop has not said a word in its disparagement. He has not denied, nor (we venture to think) would he dream of denying, that the variety of races within the Church's bosom tends importantly (if we may so express ourselves) to her intellectual and political strength. What he does deny is, that it conduces to the purity, whether of her formal or her practical teaching; to her more correct "interpretation," as Dr. Dollinger expresses it, "of Christian doctrine." This is what the *Saturday Review* alleged, quoting Dr. Dollinger's words in corroboration: this is what the Archbishop and all loyal Catholics strenuously deny.

The writer in the *Saturday Review* further complains that, as to many of his statements, the Archbishop does not argue against them, but considers them "sufficiently refuted by reproducing them." He forgets that the Archbishop is addressing Catholics; and that many opinions, which may consistently enough be advocated in a Protestant periodical, are yet in the eyes of a loyal Catholic "sufficiently refuted by reproducing them." This holds emphatically in the present instance.

We must not take leave of the *Saturday Reviewer* without drawing attention to his singular remark, that "Ultramontanism, as now understood, took its commencement from the Council of Constance." S. Gregory VII. then and Boniface VIII. were not Ultramontanes, in the present sense of that word. They were tinged, we suppose, with some shade of Gallicanism.

It will be seen clearly, from the course of our remarks, how close is the affinity of spirit between ancient Gallicanism and modern minimism. We have no temptation to discuss incidentally this latter error; with which we have just now quite enough to do in the way of direct controversy, and which occupies a very small portion of the present Pastoral. We will only give two quotations, to show how distinctly (though episodically) the Archbishop expresses his judgment.

By these words the bishops did not confirm the Acts of the Pontiff as if they needed confirmation, nor accept his declarations of truth and condemnations of error as if they needed their acceptance. They did not intend or imply that the supreme Pontifical Acts since 1862, in the form of Allocutions,

---

\* We have changed the past tense into the present in our citation, because the question of *fact* is external to our argument.



Briefs, Encyclicals, and the Syllabus, were of imperfect and only inchoate authority until their acceptance should confirm them. Nothing was further from the thoughts of the pastors of the Church. They recognized the voice of Peter in the voice of Pius, and the infallible certainty of all his declarations and condemnations, in virtue of the supreme and singular prerogative of Doctor of the Universal Church, given by our Lord Jesus Christ to Peter, and through Peter to his successors. They renewed, before the tomb of the Apostle, the adhesion they had already given, one by one, in the midst of their flocks, to the successive utterances of the Sovereign Pontiff, as these, from time to time, had reached them. The Encyclical "*Quantá Curá*," and the Syllabus or compendium of eighty condemnations in previous Encyclicals and Allocutions—all these had been at once received by them as a part of the supreme teaching of the Church, through the person of its head, which, *by the special assistance of the Holy Ghost, is preserved from all error*. They did not add certainty to that *which was already infallible* (pp. 33, 34).

Every bishop in the world had the Encyclical and Syllabus in his hands. Upon that summary of the Acts of this whole Pontificate five hundred bishops proclaim their adhesion to every declaration and every condemnation therein contained, and to every other act of doctrinal authority since their last assembly in Rome. It is the Encyclical and Syllabus which gives such force and import to the words of the Episcopate the other day. It is the basis of their Salutation, as they style the address. It will be also the basis and the guide of the General Council, prescribing and directing its deliberations and decrees (p. 39).

We must not close this particular part of our subject without drawing attention to our author's admirable refutation of the idea, that to elevate the Papal office is to disparage the Episcopal; that those who dwell more strongly on the promises to S. Peter, will dwell therefore less strongly on the promises to the body of Apostles. On the contrary, the very strength, the very dignity, the very prominence of bishops consists in their union with, and subordination to, their head. They are more humbly listened to as teachers of the Church, in proportion as they are more faithful disciples of the Universal Teacher. Which is the greater object of reverence?—a court bishop, subservient to kings and dancing attendance on ministers? or an ecclesiastically-minded prelate, who preserves pure and undefiled his loyalty to the Supreme Pontiff?

There is, perhaps, hardly any Pontiff who has governed the Church with more frequent exercises of supreme authority than Pius IX. The creation of Hierarchies, the definition of the Immaculate Conception, the declarations on the Temporal Power, the condemnations in the Encyclical of 1864, manifest, in a singular degree, the plenitude of his supreme office as the Ruler and Doctor of the Universal Church. Nevertheless there is, perhaps, no Pontiff



*who has united the whole Episcopate so closely to himself, or has called them so often to his side (p. 8).*

It is precisely then when the Holy Father is most frequent in exercising his own high prerogative, that the dignity of the Episcopate is most conspicuously exhibited. And conversely, it is when the bishops are summoned to *their* highest prerogative, that the Supreme Pontiff assumes his loftiest attitude.

The highest prerogatives of the Pontificate are partly dormant while the Church is diffused, but are fully exercised when the Church is congregated. More than this; the prerogative of Peter as the confirmer of his brethren is never so explicitly manifest as in the direction and confirmation of Councils. Every Council of the Church, from Nice to Trent, has reflected more visibly and vividly the supremacy and infallibility of the Chair of Peter. The Council of Constance, with an exceptional and explicit act, recognizes and declares the same Divine order. Supreme while as yet the See of Peter was vacant, or was claimed by competitors of doubtful election, it submitted at once when the person of the Apostle was visible upon his Chair (p. 70).

In drawing out (as he does from p. 79 to p. 102) the various important services which can be rendered by an Ecumenical Council, far more effectually than in any other possible way, the Archbishop performs an incidental service, over and above the direct one which his words express. In showing what is the imaginable purpose of such a Council, he shows also what cannot possibly be its purpose. There are some Catholics, who would be startled to hear themselves called Gallicans, who have nevertheless unconsciously imbibed a Gallican notion. They fancy that when a Council assembles, there is called into action a higher power of teaching and governing than otherwise exists. This is of course that tenet, which all genuine Ultramontanes indignantly repudiate. To S. Peter, as our author had observed (p. 18), "power was so given that he was able to act alone and supremely apart from the other Apostles; whereas the other Apostles were unable to act except in subordination to him." And so as to later bishops. God has given them the power of teaching and governing, but only in subordination to S. Peter's Chair; nor is either the infallibility or the governing power of the Supreme Pontiff in any way extended by their co-operation. No supposition can be more preposterous, than that "the future General Council is a reaction against excessive pretensions; that it will impose limits on them; that it will confirm the past acts of Popes on Gallican principles; that it will review or modify the Encyclical and Syllabus of 1864" (p. 77).

But now as regards the second particular to which we drew attention at starting—the Church's due relations with modern society. Here, as we said, there are two distinct questions to be considered: (1) the Church's doctrine, and (2) the practical application of that doctrine to existing circumstances. As to the former, our author's language is express and distinct.

The union of these two laws and jurisdictions [those of Church and State], and the supreme *direction of the supernatural over the natural law*, constitutes the Christian order of the world, as expressed in the old formulas of the concord of the Church and the empire, or of the Church and the civil powers. *Such is and always will be the Christian and Catholic jurisprudence.* If it cease to live in the kingdoms of the world, their public laws and actions, *it will always remain indelible in the theology and principles of the Catholic Church* (pp. 83, 84).

Now an objection is sometimes raised by Catholics to such language as this, which the present seems an appropriate occasion for considering. "Such a view," it is said, "as 'this doctrine of the Church's due authority over the State,' has no practical bearing whatever under present circumstances. The Archbishop himself proceeds to admit that 'the tendency of the world and of the events before our eyes' is to make it obsolete and unmeaning. Why then draw attention to that, which disgusts Protestants without 'benefiting ourselves?'"

This difficulty is felt by so many Catholics, that it seems very important to consider it explicitly. We trust therefore we shall not appear disrespectful to the Archbishop's office, if we waive all reference to his high position, and consider the objection just as we might if it were brought against any ordinary Catholic writer. Indeed it has not unfrequently been brought against ourselves. In replying to it then, we readily admit the principle on which it is grounded. It does not at all follow, because a doctrine is true, or even because it has been infallibly determined, that its expression and advocacy are always expedient. We speak of doctrines which are no integral portion of the Deposit, though (as being importantly connected therewith) they may have been infallibly ruled by the Church. And we readily admit that prudence and moderation require a writer to consider, not merely whether what he says is true, nor even whether it has been sealed with the Church's infallible impress; but also whether its inculcation at this particular time be conducive to the Church's benefit. Where the Church has long abstained from expressing some doctrine, and where that doctrine has no obvious practical bearing, it will commonly be the wisdom and the duty

of a Catholic writer to accept her implied lesson. Just as it is to the Church alone that he looks, when he desires to know what doctrine is infallibly true,—so it is to the Church alone that he looks, when he desires to know which of these doctrines, *being* infallibly true, should under particular circumstances be prominently and urgently enforced. Everything turns on this, the Church's indication of her own desire.

Now it is plain that whatever doctrines are taught in the Encyclical and Syllabus, are doctrines which she desires, not to be forgotten, but to be distinctly borne in mind; not to be passed over, but to be earnestly enforced. To the Encyclical and Syllabus then let us appeal. The 24th error condemned in the latter is, that "the Church has no power of employing force, nor has she any temporal power direct or indirect." Again, in condemning the 31st error therein recited, Pius IX. puts forth the *de jure* claim of clerics under certain circumstances to be exempted from secular tribunals. In several portions of the Encyclical and in three well-known propositions of the Syllabus, he peremptorily condemns the modern notion that liberty of worships and of the press are in themselves desirable.\* Now in 1867 we cannot consider the decisions of Dec. 1864 to be obsolete. What the Holy Father *then* wished, he now wishes, to be prominently asserted. Even if Catholics could see no reason for this, the indication of his wish is amply sufficient to direct their conduct.

We repeat this statement. Even if a Catholic writer could not himself see the benefit to be obtained by his advocacy of some true doctrine, it is amply sufficient for his guidance that the Teacher of all Christians desires its inculcation. The benefit of that inculcation may be really great, though an individual do not happen to see it. How often it happens that some speculative truth produces the most unexpected and invaluable practical results! To take a very trite illustration. A number of ancient geometers investigated the properties of conic sections; a purely speculative investigation; circumstances arose which those geometers could not have ever so distantly imagined; and behold a precious practical result of their speculative studies, in tracing the planetary movements. So in the present case. No one can say that the present condition of European society is normal or stable, for it rests on no one definite and consistent principle. Who can tell what revolutions are in store for the civilized world? what circumstances,

---

\* In April, 1865, from p. 487 to p. 492, we drew out as precisely as we could the doctrine taught on this subject in the Encyclical and Syllabus.

now quite unimaginable, may arise? At some future period the doctrine of the Church's power in things temporal may be—in some corner of the earth, or even in large portions of it—the very bond of new social relations, the very anchor of strength and stability. "A new European order," says the Archbishop (p. 100), "may spring up around the See of S. Peter; and the Pontiffs will enter into new relations with a new world, upon old laws which are changeless as the succession of seasons and of tides."

(2) Then further, even at the present time, though the doctrine were not directly practical, it might be indirectly practical in a high degree. Our meaning may be thus illustrated. In a theological treatise on the Trinity or the Incarnation, there are several propositions which cannot be called directly practical; for the keenest dogmatic student does not actually consider them in his prayers and meditations. Yet their indirect practical value is very great. They enable theologians to grasp far more thoroughly the substance of the doctrine; from theologians this greater keenness of apprehension spreads through the body of priests, and through these again it reaches the faithful in general. Something very analogous takes place on the matter before us. To contemplate steadily the authority over society which God has given to the Church, conduces signally to increased unworldliness of view; to a keener sense of the intrinsic superiority possessed over things temporal by things spiritual; to a profounder and higher conception of the Church's office; to a more undivided and ardent loyalty towards the Holy See.

Moreover (3) this doctrine is at all events most directly practical as regards one immediate inference. We mentioned in a previous note a remarkable article, which has recently appeared in the *Chronicle*. That article speaks most explicitly on the ecclesiastical authority adducible for the doctrines of which we are speaking. "The theory of intolerance has been held, not only by Pius IX., but by a whole catena of Popes before him. It is found in the great divines, in Fathers and Doctors, in the lives and writings of Saints, in the acts of Councils, and in the ecclesiastical law." Again, "The Pope has made a point in the *Syllabus* . . . of insisting on claims and theories which he has no prospect of being able to enforce. It is clear that he does so for the sake of the principle." To surrender this doctrine then—the doctrine of the Church's divinely-given authority over society—is, by most immediate consequence, to surrender belief in the Church's infallibility.

Were it only indeed for this reason, we think that to express frankly the Church's true doctrine is in such times as these the

only course for a Catholic controversialist. If there is one specialty of the day, it is historical research; and consequently, if there is one class of objections which it is impossible to ignore, it is that which is founded on history. What reply shall be given to those anti-Catholic disputants, who throw in your teeth the facts of mediæval times? Even if it were expedient it would not be right—and even if it were right it would not be expedient—to defend the Church's acts, except by the Church's doctrine. "Liberal Catholics" are often most pious men; admirable servants of God; and, in intention, zealous sons of the Church; but their view has no intellectual basis whatever. Liberalism is a consistent system, wrought out by man (in part consciously, in part unconsciously) from a fundamentally false principle. Catholicism is a divine system, implying throughout that principle which directly contradicts liberalism, viz., the dogmatic. In fair argument with a rightly-disposed inquirer, the truth of the latter principle and the falsehood of the former may be triumphantly evinced. But the "liberal Catholic" is afraid to break with either of the two; nor can he give any intelligible reason, why at this or that particular point he parts company with one and cleaves to the other. In argument, as appears to us, the "liberal Catholic" must always go to the wall, when pressed either by consistent Catholics or consistent Liberals.

But at last (4), Catholic doctrine, on the true relation between Church and State, is in some sense even in itself directly practical at this very moment. In the States of the Church entirely—in Spain to a considerable extent—it corresponds with actual facts; and the natives of those states are taught by the Church to value, as a high and peculiar privilege, the co-operation of the civil power in securing their religious unity. But moreover, in every part of the civilized world it is abundantly possible, that at any moment some assault may be made against some part of that moral basis on which society now rests. The history of the Mormonites alone suffices to show, that the modern world is by no means exempt from that danger; and in such a case the Encyclical and Syllabus point to the conclusion, that such attempts should be put down by the law's strong hand. It was pointed out last April in this REVIEW (p. 337) how many English public writers, even now, are prepared to approve the use of those very weapons against modern moral and social revolutionists, which, as put in force against their own religious ancestors three hundred years ago, they are so ready to denounce under the odious name of persecution.

At the same time it must be fully admitted, that if a Catholic

writer does express such principles as the above, he is bound to guard most carefully against possible misconception. He is bound to explain distinctly, that the true service of material force is the retaining of a country in that religious unity which she possesses, not the reinstating her in that which she has unhappily lost. He is bound to protest against the notion, so widely prevalent among enemies of the Church, that if the relative number of Catholics and Protestants in England were reversed, the former would retaliate on the latter the persecutions, material and social, which they themselves endured. But the last thing of which any one can accuse our present author, is the having failed in this duty. Indeed, more than this, he has done the fullest justice to the incidental benefits derivable, from that deplorable separation of Church and State, which is the great social characteristic of our time. What language can be more express than the following?

The day seems to be past for the Church to unite itself with the civil state of modern nations. They have shattered their unity of religion, and have broken up their public law to conform it to their religious divisions. *Over such mixed states the Church has little disposition to assume control.* They are too alien from its mind and essence. This separation of Church and State, abnormal, and replete with moral and spiritual dangers, is an established fact in the larger part of the modern world. The Church can at least draw from it this advantage, that if the State will no longer invite it to save the people, *its own spiritual action is left free and pure* (pp. 98, 99).

Our readers may possibly remember his Grace's remarks at Birmingham in January last, on the golden, iron, and silver ages. The golden age, he said in effect, was the age of religious unity, when the Church exercised in peace her divinely-given authority over the State. This has passed away, perhaps for ever: at all events, there are no present appearances of its return. The iron age has been the period, when religious unity has been entirely shattered, but Christians have not seen the full significance of this fact: it has been the age of mutual violence among Christian denominations; of Stateoppression, civil disabilities, material and social persecution. In the silver age, which is now being fast inaugurated, the various Christian societies employ against each other no weapons, but those of argument and persuasion; while the State preserves a rigid impartiality in her dealings with them all. The same general thought is expressed in the present Pastoral.

The withdrawal of Christian nations, or of their public laws, from the unity of the faith, *has produced in past times prolonged conflicts between the supreme spiritual and civil powers.* In England, to pass over all other countries, the pena<sup>1</sup>



laws in matters of religion, by which not only Catholics but Protestant Non-conformists were persecuted, is a page of our history over which we are happy now to be able to draw a veil. So long as the civil power exacted conformity and obedience in matters spiritual, the consciences of Catholics placed them in an unnatural state of passive opposition to supreme authority. It is the dictate of our conscience, founded upon the words of our Lord and of His Apostles, upon the precepts of the Fathers and the decrees of Councils, that we should render true and faithful obedience in all civil matters to our lawful prince. An oath of pure civil obedience Catholics are bound by their religion to make, from their hearts, to the person of their sovereign. Happily, all the elements of religious and ecclesiastical matter, which used to be mixed up with these civil oaths, have gradually been purged away. The laws of England, with the exception only of a few lingering stains of the old anti-Catholic animosity, *have become purely civil, and therefore equal and just to all*: and within that sphere of civil life and civil obedience it is impossible that collision or conflict should arise (pp. 96-98).

Another remark of the Archbishop's draws attention to a fact, which has been (we think) but little thought of in comparison with its great importance. The political predominance of Popes and bishops has long been superseded by the political predominance of statesmen; but the political predominance of statesmen is now in its turn being rapidly superseded by that of the million.

The Governments of the world may be Febronian or Voltairian; the spirit of Pombal and of Kaunitz may survive in bureaux and portfolios; but the instincts of the masses are Christian, and the tendency of political society is everywhere to the people. Of this we have no fear. The Church is nowhere more vigorous than where it is in closest sympathy with the people; as in Ireland and Poland, in America, Australia, and in England (p. 101).

We confess that there is a tone of confidence in these words, with which we cannot entirely sympathize. Considering the kind of education which the lower classes now receive, we wish we could be devoid of "fear" as to the result of recent changes. But this is a question, on which the Archbishop's opinion deserves most respectful deference, and on which we heartily hope that he is in the right. So much at all events is certain, that the Church has far more probability of directly influencing peoples, than of directly influencing their respective Governments. And no second opinion is possible, on the practical lessons derivable from the present tendency of nations to a more or less disguised democracy. If the Church is in any degree to guide and influence the course of political events, it must be by directly addressing herself to the masses. Let her only seat her authority



firmly in their convictions and in their love, she may laugh at the impotent opposition of politicians, philosophers, and journalists.

In conclusion, we will quote a paragraph which we observed with great pleasure in the *Westminster Gazette* of Nov. 9:—“A private letter from Rome informs us that the Holy Father was pleased to direct his felicitations to be conveyed to the Archbishop of Westminster on his Gracco's recent Pastoral, which was read to his Holiness by Cardinal Bilio. The Pope appears to have noticed for special approbation that portion of the Pastoral which treats of the coming General Council.” Under present circumstances, however, the Pope would not have been under any necessity of resorting to the services of an English-speaking Cardinal; for we have before us an Italian translation of the Pastoral, published in Rome with the “*imprimatur*” of the Master of the Sacred Palace, and also of the Vicegerent of Rome.

---

### ART. III.—S. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY.

*The Life and Martyrdom of S. Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Legate of the Holy See.* By JOHN MORRIS, Canon of Northampton.

*History of the Contest between Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Henry II., King of England.* By the late Rev. R. H. FROUDE, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.

**A**MONG the English Saints, there is none that has shone with a brighter light on the page of history than S. Thomas of Canterbury; and this is the more remarkable, as the portion of his life which has entitled him to a place in the Calendar of the Saints, was comparatively short. Ever of spotless purity and deep and sincere devotion, the splendour and heroic daring of that great and noble soul seems yet to have been, if we may say so, at least to a certain extent, wasted upon the things of earth for many years of his life; for he had numbered no less than forty-four of them when he was appointed to the see of Canterbury. The elevation of soul was indeed there, the realization of things magnificent, glorious, and beautiful, existed and found their expression in a retinue and paraphernalia more splendid than any which had ever graced a minister of the kings of England—one might say of Europe—during the middle ages. But the glory of the king's daughter is within, and it was not meant that

a mind so capable of true greatness should waste its light on the gaudy toys of earth.

Much has been said and argued by historians respecting the real character of S. Thomas of Canterbury, and of the apparent change which took place in that character after he exchanged the mace of chancellor for the pastoral staff of archbishop. We are not disposed to contend with Protestant historians on this subject: if it is difficult for an ordinary Catholic, as it surely is, though surrounded with all the light of God's Church, and the blessings of her guidance and teaching, to enter into the views and fathom the mind, to sound the depths, as it were, of those great souls whom God has called "to shine as the stars" as His Saints—how impossible must it be for those who know not the most elementary truths from which that sanctity takes its rise, to comprehend a course of life and action which has its life-springs from those truths and that teaching which emanates from that Church, whence alone flow the waters of salvation and sanctity. Yet to show that in proportion as a "dim light began to steal over souls whom it has pleased God in later years to draw towards some vague knowledge of the truth of His Church, they began to have a conviction of the manner in which His Saints had been misunderstood and misrepresented, we may make a quotation on this subject from Mr. Froude, whose great genius never had its scope, and whose yearnings after the light of truth were never permitted to be fulfilled in this life:—

It appears to him (the writer of this history of the contest between Thomas à Becket and Henry II.) that Thomas à Becket during the time of his chancellorship, though necessarily engaged in pursuits inconsistent with the sacred office of deacon, and though entering into those pursuits with perhaps more than necessary keenness, preserved nevertheless throughout an innocence and even austerity of character, which in a layman would have been justly regarded as a proof of unusual seriousness. This appears not only from the general assertions of all contemporary historians, who though they have shown no desire to conceal the failings of this part of his life are yet unanimous in their testimony to this effect, but is likewise corroborated by circumstantial statements to which of course more weight is due.

The story which follows in Mr. Froude's work is mentioned by several of the biographers of S. Thomas; of how one of his hosts, desirous of ascertaining by personal observation how far the Chancellor deserved the reputation he bore for regularity and uprightness of life, entered his bedroom at night with a lantern. The bed was not occupied by the great

minister of state, who was however perceived by his astonished host in a profound sleep, stretched at length on the bare boards. Mr. Froude proceeds :—

Now it is obvious to say that this anecdote proves nothing ; yet the considerate reader will doubtless bear in mind that it is not every chancellor of whom such anecdotes have been preserved ; nor will he regard the person of whose private habits we have this slender notice exactly in the same light as if we knew nothing of them. This anecdote is recorded by William of Canterbury, one of the authors of the *Quadrilogue*. From another of his biographers we hear . . . of the severe penitential discipline to which he was in the habit of subjecting himself, and adds the circumstance that when in London he received it at the hands of Raoul, prior of Trinity, and when in Canterbury from Thomas, a priest of S. Martin's. And again, when asserting the spotless purity of the Chancellor's moral conduct, he appeals to the declaration of his confessor, Robert, canon of Merton, "from whom," says he, "I heard it myself." . . . If we could forget the fact that Thomas à Becket, when Chancellor of England, was not a layman, there are perhaps few characters of his age that we should contemplate with more unmingled pleasure and admiration. As principal law officer of the kingdom, the difficult task devolved on him of re-establishing order and good government in a country habituated to anarchy for twenty years. And the ease and rapidity with which he accomplished it is just matter of wonder. As a military commander, though without any advantages of birth, and in an age when perhaps aristocratic prejudices were just at the highest, he seems to have been the acknowledged leader of the chivalry of England. Seven hundred knights of distinguished prowess enlisted under his banner ; and some of the haughtiest barons of the realm were proud to be designated his liegemen. As a diplomatist he acquired such an influence over the king and nobility of France, that notwithstanding the losses he had occasioned them in the field, and the concessions he had extorted from them by negotiation, he was received in that country with open arms, and provided with an asylum at the king's expense during the six years of his proscription. In short, there seems to have been a sort of fascination about him which triumphed alike over the interests and prejudices of all he came into contact with. His person is said to have been pre-eminently beautiful ; his manners grave or playful as occasion required ; every detail of his establishment to have indicated at once his splendour and good taste. Among other things it is mentioned of his band of music that it was the admiration of both armies, the French and the English. And yet this was the person who could choose bare boards for the place of his repose, and submit to the discipline of the scourge from his religious advisers. England must have retrograded sadly if such characters were ever common in her annals.

Thus far Mr. Froude. But let us go to more Catholic sources to hear the circumstances of the birth and early life of one who was to prove so great a saint and champion of the Church of God.

In Canon Morris's *Life of S. Thomas à Becket*, a work which cannot be too highly praised for its full and accurate details, and the deep interest of its many and varied anecdotes of the Saint, we read that S. Thomas was the son of Gilbert and Matilda Becket, citizens of London. Such is the Saint's own simple account of his parents, who would seem however to have been in good, if not affluent circumstances, from the fact of their having been able to give their son a good education. Nor were there wanting the usual wonders which mostly surround God's Saints from their cradle, and even forestall their birth.

Previous to his birth (says Canon Morris) his mother dreamed that the river Thames flowed into her bosom. Startled by so unusual a dream, she went to consult a learned religious, who, having forewarned her that dreams were not to be attended to, nor a woman's visions made much of, told her that in Scripture water signified people, but that he could not undertake to interpret her vision. She dreamt again that when she was visiting Canterbury cathedral to pray there, the child prevented her entrance.

As the time of his birth drew near, it seemed to his mother as if twelve stars of unusual brilliancy had fallen into her lap. It is also said that she dreamt that she was bearing Canterbury Cathedral, and that when the Saint was born, the nurse, as she held him, exclaimed, "I have an Archbishop in my arms."

He was born on Tuesday, December 21st, 1117, and after Vespers on the same day he was baptized by the name of S. Thomas the Apostle, whose festival it was. It would seem that S. Thomas had the blessing, vouchsafed so often by God to those whom He designs to serve Him at the altar, of a good and pious mother, who early taught him a tender love of Our Blessed Lady and a great compassion for the poor.

The well-known story of S. Thomas's eastern origin must not here be omitted, for though there does not appear to be any deep historical foundation for its facts, it seems almost of too remarkable a character to be a mere fiction, and the fire of our Saint's temperament, and his varied and unusual natural gifts, might well lead one to suppose that he united the Oriental and Norman races in his blood.

When his father, Gilbert, was a young man, he took upon him our Lord's cross, and set out for the Holy Land, accompanied by a faithful servant named Richard. On their road, however, they fell into the hands of the Saracens, and became the slaves of a certain infidel chief named Amurath, with whom, however, Gilbert got into such favour as to be employed to wait at his table, and even to converse with his master, to whom he not only detailed the manners and customs of the

countries of the West, but spoke of his religion with all the fervour of one who had braved so much for its sake. These conversations made a deep impression on the only daughter of Amurath, and yet more so, when she found, upon questioning Gilbert further, that he expressed his willingness to die for the faith he professed. The eastern maiden was so struck with a religion which exercised such an influence over its disciple, and with the earnest and devoted character of the disciple himself, that she offered to become a Christian if Gilbert would promise by his faith to make her his wife. Gilbert, however, fearful of some treachery, treated her with doubt and deliberation, and found means, with other his fellow captives, to effect his escape; but the devotion of the eastern maiden was no ways destroyed by his flight, and with the knowledge of only two words of English, Gilbert and London, the name of her lover, and his place of abode, to aid her in her search, she resolved to brave all dangers to find Becket. The legend tells us that joining a band of returning pilgrims, she reached London, and there she wandered through the streets calling constantly upon him whom she sought by his name, gazed at by the passers-by, in her foreign dress as if a distracted creature. Gilbert's servant Richard saw and recognized her as she passed his master's house, and told Gilbert of the strange news. Becket, with the prudence which he showed in the first instance, and which certainly seems to have outweighed his vanity, desired his servant to conduct the Saracen maiden to the house of a widowed neighbour until he could take ghostly counsel about her; then, repairing to S. Paul's, he asked the advice of the Bishop of London, and by the counsel of that prelate the maiden was duly instructed in the Christian faith, and became the wife of Gilbert Becket. Nor had he cause to repent of his marriage, for the qualities possessed by his convert wife, and which showed a heart capable of such high resolve and endurance of hardships for an earthly love, grew and spread into the highest Christian virtues, so that when almost immediately after their marriage Gilbert was seized with a pious longing to visit the Holy Land a second time, his wife urged him to give place to any plans he might form for the greater glory of God, professing her firm faith in the protection of Him who had so wonderfully hitherto preserved her and brought her into His Church, and to the perfect knowledge of Himself. Gilbert, therefore, went again to Palestine, and during his absence S. Thomas was born, whom he found on his return a beautiful, intelligent child of three years and a half old, and the admiration of all who knew him.

But we will proceed with the more strictly historical details of the Saint.

At an early age he was placed under the care of Robert, Prior of Merton, who was ever his faithful friend and spiritual guide, his confessor while he was chancellor, and at his side when he was martyred. The earlier years of our Saint were thus passed in study, and his education probably finished at Paris, whither he seems to have gone after his father's death. By the time S. Thomas entered upon life, as it is called, both his parents were dead. His mother, whose loss S. Thomas felt very deeply, died when he was only twenty-one, and his father shortly afterwards. He went then to live with a relation who was a rich merchant, and in his house he learned much of those business-like habits which he ultimately used to the benefit of State and Church. He soon, however, passed into the service of Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, and there it was that his rare talents and remarkable character which in his embassies to Rome and elsewhere, on the part of the archbishop had already much advanced King Henry's interests, so drew the attention and regard of that monarch that he made him chancellor, and entrusted him with the most important affairs of his kingdom, and not satisfied with heaping upon him all the honours and preferment which fell within his grasp, he made him tutor to his son the young Prince Henry.

The devotion and energy of S. Thomas's character was now drawn out in the service of an earthly master, and he distinguished himself as a soldier no less than as a statesman—nor can we be surprised, considering the manners of the age, that a man who, though in holy orders, was not a priest, should, as Chancellor of the kingdom, and the king's chief minister, lead his forces to the battle-field. Lingard tells us that during S. Thomas's campaign in the duchy of Toulouse; which Henry was endeavouring to possess himself of, he took three castles hitherto deemed impregnable, and tilted with a French knight whose horse he bore off as the honourable proof of his victory. During this same campaign he brought with him a body of 700 knights at his own expense, whom he headed himself, and was foremost in every enterprise. But it was in a very different battle-field that God intended his servant should wage war; he was to contend with that very master he was now so zealous to serve, to fight for a heavenly master against an earthly one, for the interests and defence of the Church against the world, and that evil one who makes common cause with the world.

Henry the Second, to whom power and dominion was the chief aim of existence, seeing in S. Thomas à Becket a man



of unbounded abilities, and a resolution which equalled them, and knowing his great attachment and loyalty to himself, proposed to himself to make him Archbishop of Canterbury, by which step he considered that he could obtain, as he wished, an entire power over the Church as over the State, and render the former his complete slave both in rights and in revenues. With this view, and with that despotic absoluteness which was a part of his character, Henry forced upon the unwilling acceptance of his chancellor the Archbishopric of Canterbury, and thenceforward Thomas à Becket was a changed man. A changed man, yet not a different man, but the character went through that sort of change which would come over a mind, vigorous, earnest, deep, and thoughtful, when it feels that the hand of God has come upon it almost against its will, and drawing aside the curtain of earthly vanities, displays by some great turn in its life, to the gaze of the stricken soul, the solemn and awful realities of the unseen world.

Something of this seemed to come as a warning voice to S. Thomas's heart when the first rumours of his probable ecclesiastical elevation reached him; for when the Prior of Leicester, who was joking him on the gaiety of his attire as being unfit for a churchman, alluded to the common rumour of his being raised to the primacy, he said: "I know three poor priests in England, any one of whom I had rather see promoted to the archbishopric than myself, for I know my lord the king so intimately that I am sure I should have to choose between his favour and that of Almighty God if I were appointed."

No doubt the years he had spent in a Court, and above all such a one as Henry the Second's, had not been without their due effect on such a mind as his, and he had been able to weigh in their fullest balance the uncertain favour of man and the shortlived glories of this earth. Once the earthly representative of an undying King, all the trappings of the worldly glory for which he had been so noted were laid aside, and the strict sobriety of the ecclesiastical "cappa" took the place of the gorgeous robes for which he had been so remarkable. Just as a seed buried in the earth springs forth into beauty and fragrance of which the mind has no conception until the change takes place, so the ideas of earthly glory being buried in the love of God, took deep root and sprang up to bloom, and finally to blossom with the scarlet flowers of martyrdom.

It matters but little to that God to whom a thousand years are but as one day, whether the period be early or late that a man masters the idea of sanctity. He looks to the *heart*, and if that is true, simple, and fervent, ready to give Him all, and adhere to Him with an unswerving devotion,—it is not for us



to say wherefore He calls some of His greatest servants in the middle or even the later years of their life; why He strikes them down like the great Saint of Manresa while fighting for earthly glory, or pours the dew of heavenly tears upon them at their consecration rather than give them their fullest measure of Divine grace in their childhood or at their baptism. Suffice it that he deals differently with His children, illustrating thus the parable of those who have worked in His vineyard in the morning, the noon, or the evening of the day.

And now that S. Thomas has thrown his whole soul into the cause of Heaven, we see the rain of Divine grace beginning to water the fields of a mind possessing so strong an impress of its Creator. How rapidly this takes place, those pious souls can best tell us who having given themselves with a strong and earnest will entirely to God, begin to feel a new life and existence in prayer and the presence of God, the very idea of which was unknown to them before. And as the storm of persecution gathered round S. Thomas, his heart deepened and strengthened in God's love. And the clouds were indeed collecting fast.

S. Thomas having been previously ordained priest, was consecrated bishop on the octave of Pentecost, Trinity Sunday, June 3rd, 1162, in his metropolitan church, by Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester, brother of the late King Stephen, and a man of great piety and holiness of life, whose views were raised to the clear light of heavenly truths, as is well proved by the speech he made immediately after the consecration of S. Thomas, whom he addressed thus:—

“Dearest brother, I give you now the choice of two things; beyond a doubt you must lose the favour of the earthly or of the heavenly King.”

The words would seem to have been almost prophetic; and the Saint replied to them with fervour and floods of tears as he knelt for the bishop's blessing: “By God's help and strength I now make my choice, and never for the love and favour of an earthly king will I forego the grace of the King of Heaven.”

The monastery of Christ Church, Canterbury was at that time under the immediate rule of the archbishop, who was its head or abbot, though the prior managed the internal government of the community, and the realization that he was in some sense a religious must have added a yet greater solemnity to an earnest mind like that of S. Thomas to the dignity of the Primacy. Notwithstanding his varied avocations, and the press of business which now came upon him, he led the life of a true monk, with such additions as his own saintliness

suggested. He rose to matins with the community, after which he washed and kissed the feet of thirteen poor men, giving them a meal with his own hand; then after a short time given to repose he went to the study of the Holy Scriptures, after which he either said Mass himself or assisted at it, abstaining at times from offering up the Holy Sacrifice through reverence and humility. "Those who frequently assisted at his Mass," says his chaplain, and intimate friend, Herbert de Boscham, "can bear witness to the tears and sighs the presence of his Lord drew from him, and to the very great devotion with which he celebrated." "When he was alone," says another of his intimate friends, "he shed tears in wonderful abundance; and when he stood at the altar he seemed in very presence of the flesh to see the Passion of the Lord. He handled the Divine Sacraments with great reverence, so that his very handling of them strengthened the faith and fervour of those who witnessed it."

It would appear from different circumstances in his life to which his friends and biographers allude, that the archbishop's bodily temperament and constitution sympathized with his mind, and was of a very sensitive character. He felt cold acutely, and was subject to an illness which excitement or anxiety would readily bring on, causing acute pain in his side. This explains the quantity of clothing he was wont to wear, and, added to the habits of his life at Court for so many years, would render it difficult for him to adopt all the austerity of food which he evidently desired, since not only do his biographers speak much of his temperance at table as archbishop, but in his exile at Pontigni he much injured his health by attempting to follow the rule of the monks of that monastery. And to such a temperament as we have described, delicate and sensitive both by nature and bringing up, it must have been no ordinary bodily austerity to put on a hair shirt, which is described as one of unusual severity, and which he wore from the day of his consecration till his martyrdom. His biographer, Herbert, gives testimony of his remarkable temperance at table, rendered the more striking by the need his many years passed in the world had brought of his food not being of a coarser sort than he had been accustomed to, and relates an anecdote of a person who was dining with him, and who remarked with a smile on the delicacy of his food. S. Thomas gave him the indirect advice of correcting himself before he looked about for his neighbour's shortcomings. "Certes, brother, if I am not mistaken, you take your bean with greater eagerness than I the pheasant before me." Herbert adds that the reproof was deserved. "This person lived with

us for a while," he says, "and though he did not care for delicacies, for he was not used to them, he was truly a glutton of grosser food."

From some cause, however, the archbishop did not leave off the magnificence of his attire till the close of the first year of his consecration; and the great sincerity and humility of his character would lead one to believe that this arose from a wish to conceal the graces which the Holy Spirit was working within. However, it scandalized the community of monks over whom he now presided; and one of the religious, "who was more intimate with him than the others, reproved him for it, and undertook to relate to him a dream that one of the community had had regarding it. "Go tell *the Chancellor*," a grave and venerable personage had seemed to say to him, by the title he made use of marking his indignation, "to change his dress without delay; and if he refuse to do so, I will oppose him all the days of his life." To the reproof, S. Thomas made no reply, but he burst into tears. However, he thenceforth laid aside his gorgeous dress, and clad himself as a very priest.

His alms were abundant and profuse, and his love and personal tenderness towards the poor is proved by their enthusiasm for him as he came out of the Council at Northampton, when the crowds of poor on their knees begging his blessing would hardly let him pass; and on his return to England, after his exile, as will be seen as we pursue his life to its close.

Following out the scheme of absolute power which Henry the Second proposed to himself, this king no sooner saw his former Chancellor in the right position, as he considered, to subject the Church of God to him, than he began his attacks upon it in good earnest. Even while Chancellor, S. Thomas had earnestly entreated the king to fill up the vacant bishoprics with canonically appointed pastors, and thereby put an end to the abuse which had been so common under the Norman monarchs of keeping their revenues in the royal treasury. Perhaps King Henry was willing to show some special favour to his old friend on his first taking the command of the Church in England; for we read that two fitting bishops were appointed to the sees of Worcester and Gloucester. But the annoyance Henry showed at the resignation of the chancellorship by the archbishop, would surely go far to show us what the king had expected of him whom he had thus elevated to the Primacy, and how much he hoped that he had a State bishop who would further, and not oppose, his attempts against the liberties of the Church.

Under pretence of the better government of his kingdom, and prevention of many disorders, King Henry required that the clergy who broke the laws, or were guilty of any crime, should be degraded from their orders by the archbishop or bishops, and delivered over to the king's courts of justice for corporal punishment from the civil magistrate: the king also contended that he was the fitting person to give away Church benefices, and to keep their revenues while they were vacant; and it followed, of course, that if the king were in want of money he would not hurry himself to fill up such vacancies. No one in holy orders was to leave the country without the king's leave. No one holding an appointment from the Crown or any of the royal household, were to be subject to the Church's chastisements without the king's leave. Appeals amongst the clergy were to go through the different degrees from archdeacon to bishop, and thence to archbishop, whence they could not go further without the king's leave, who thus effectually stopped appeals to the Pope and reference to Rome, the mother of all the Churches of Christendom. This was the purport and outline of the celebrated Constitutions of Clarendon, so far as they affected the Church; nor was it probable that a man clear-sighted as S. Thomas, with the views of a growing Saint as to the rights of the Spouse of Christ, would consent to see her thus in bonds under his archiepiscopate. The bishops were summoned and commanded by the king to promise that they would in all things observe and conform to the "royal customs," the ancient laws and customs of his kingdom, of which these Constitutions of Clarendon were alleged to be part, and which he urged had been sanctioned by long usage under his predecessors. Nor was Henry without support even amongst the clergy; and this brings us to the subject of one of the bishops, whose part was so prominent in the contest which ensued, that a few words must be said upon his character.

Gilbert Foliot, Bishop of London, was originally a monk of the order of Clugni, who after becoming prior of his monastery, was made successively abbot of the Benedictine abbey of S. Peter, Gloucester, Bishop of Hereford, and finally advanced to the see of London. He was a man of considerable austerity of life and reputation for sanctity; indeed on the former point the Pope himself had remonstrated with him, as carrying his self-severity too far for his health, and even endangering his life; but he had one most suspicious element in his character, which was a sort of key-note by which we may almost be sure as to the part he would take in such a contest as the present, and which generally shows unmis-

takably the difference between the true Shepherd and hireling. Gilbert Foliot, though living the life of an ascetic, yet dreaded above all things the loss of the royal favour. No doubt he did not definitely put before his mind that this was a worse evil than the loss of the favour of the King of Heaven; but just as S. Thomas dreaded the bare chance of offending God in pleasing the king, so the Bishop of London grew distressed and found his conscience driven into a corner when the two duties appeared to clash. An instance of this occurred in a dispute between a dependant of one of the nobility and a small community of monks near London, who had been deprived of their farm by this man, which being referred to the Pope, he had ordered the Bishop to obtain immediate restitution or to excommunicate the offending party and his patron. The offender would not give up the farm, and to excommunicate the noble without the king's licence, which Henry would not give, would entail terrible consequences.

The Bishop seems driven to distraction by the alternative. "Rather," he says, "would I have been without my bishopric than incur either of these calamities: either of the swords which hang over me is heavy, one of which kills the soul, the other the body; the former indeed heavier, *but the latter is by no means light*. . . . If, indeed, the cause were one in which death or exile could be worthily undergone, gladly would I face either in compliance with my lord the Pope's wishes. But surely six miserable monks dwelling together in Pauteney, without any rule or order, are not of such importance, that to obtain for them a few acres of land, the Chief Priest of Christendom should interrupt his friendly relations with the king of England."\* This melancholy exhibition of the poor Bishop's views prepares us for his conduct in the battle before us, and shows us how truly it is the heart of a man which is everything before the eyes of the all-seeing God; it was this heart which was so true in S. Thomas of Canterbury, even amidst his earlier shortcomings, and so false in Gilbert of London, though surrounded with fasts and prayers.

Certain it is that with that curious instinct with which "those who are of this world" find each other out, and cleave together, Henry singled out this bishop as one of his chief aids in the coming struggle, while he as intuitively stood by the king.

The Council of Westminster was the first holden by the king to propose and enforce his claims on the Church; and here S. Thomas first realized the weakness of his suffragans,

---

\* Froude, p. 44.

none of whom were prepared to stand by him in the coming struggle. S. Thomas put before them that the liberty of the Church was in peril. "Let the liberty of the Church perish, lest we perish ourselves," was their reply; "much must be yielded to the malice of the times." This was an allusion to the German antipope. The reply roused S. Thomas's zeal. "Who hath bewitched you, O foolish bishops! Much must be yielded to the malice of the time, I grant; but are we to add sin to sin? It is when the Church is in trouble, and not merely in times of peace, that a bishop must dare to do his duty. It was not more meritorious for bishops of old to give their blood for the Church than it is now to die in defence of her liberty. I declare, God be my witness, that it is not safe for us to leave that form which we have received from our holy fathers."

Thus the archbishop made known to his brethren of the Episcopate, the high and saintly principles which should animate those whom God has called to be the guardians of His Church and Her rights. But the whole flock of bishops quailed with fear, and "straightway," says one of his old historians, "you might see all the pillars of the Church to tremble as reeds before the wind" (of the king's wrath). Nor did anything support them against the terrors with which they were threatened except the firmness of his Lordship of Canterbury.

The king did not fail to bring what personal remonstrance could effect on his former favourite to bend him to his wishes, and Roger of Pontigni gives an account of this in an interview King Henry had with the Saint after the Council of Westminster, when the former reminded him of his having raised him from a mean station to the highest dignities of his kingdom, and reproached him with forgetting his affection, and showing ingratitude in thus turning against him, to which the Saint made this beautiful reply: "Far be it from me, my lord; I am not ungrateful for the favours which I received, not from yourself alone, but from God, through you; wherefore far be it from me to resist your will as long as it agrees with the will of God. Your worthiness knows how faithful I have been to you from whom I look but for an earthly reward; how much more then must I do faithful service to Almighty God, from whom I have received what is temporal, and hope for what is eternal! You are my lord, but He is your Lord and mine, and it would be good for neither of us that I should leave His will for yours; for in the awful judgment we shall both be judged as the servants of our Lord, and one will not be able to answer for the other. We must obey our tem-



poral lords, but not against God, for S. Peter says we must obey God rather than man."

To this the king replied that he did not want him to preach him a sermon just then, and asked him if he was not the son of one of his rustics. S. Thomas answered, "In truth I am not sprung of royal race; no more was blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, on whom the Lord deigned to confer the keys of heaven and the headship of the universal Church." "True," said the king, "but he died for his Lord." The primate replied, "I too will die for my Lord when the time comes."

The soul of Henry Plantagenet was cankered to its very core by worldly ambition and the greatness of this world, and it is worth while here to contemplate his character as contrasted with that of Thomas à Becket. For it is well known that Henry the Second has always borne the character of a great king, and of a great man, according to the standard of this world's greatness. Yet such was the fashion of his greatness that he could not even comprehend the true and only real grandeur and dignity which belongs to the children of light. To such a mind an increase of that which he held to be the one great object of existence, worldly power and dominion, was the only motive to which he could attribute so great a change as the feelings and views of the former chancellor had undergone: and while he measured his friend by the same earthly standard, asking him if he had not raised him from the ranks of the vassals to the highest dignity of the realm, as it were to bring to his senses one who seemed to him to be aiming at something above his sovereign, he no doubt regarded him, as do so often souls unable to see through the mist of worldliness into the minds of the true children of the Catholic Church, as sacrificing to ambition a friendship, and stifling an affection which the deep piety and high devotion now embraced by S. Thomas would but have purified and exalted. That much of S. Thomas's great regard for Henry remained even through the cruel and bitter persecution he underwent from that prince, we have most touching instances of, and amongst others one of a vision St. Thomas had concerning him, and which he related during his exile to Herbert de Bosham, to whom, he added, that he should yet help Henry in some of his troubles. Of such a character is the affection of saints. While the king treated with the bitterest resentment and cruelty everything belonging to the man whose regard he held to have cooled towards him. Of such a character is the affection of men of the world.

The Council of Clarendon was then summoned by the king



in order to enforce if possible a public acceptance of "his customs," the Council of Westminster having shown a public opposition to them. And in order to terrify the bishops into submission he filled the council chamber with armed men.

Meanwhile several of the bishops and some of the most powerful lay noblemen, seeing matters coming to great extremities, went to S. Thomas, and urged him for the sake of peace to pacify the king by promising to observe the customs; assuring him that it was merely a question of words, and the king's personal dignity, which he did not like should appear worsted in the contest, and that he would never think of enforcing his demands.

Influenced by their protestations and entreaties, almost against his better judgment, S. Thomas went to the king, and with that beautiful simplicity and confiding ingenuousness which formed part of his character, and made him ready to hope that the king would deal with him as he would with the king, he told him, that trusting in his sovereign's prudence and moderation, he would promise in good faith to observe the customs.

Whatever may be thought of this action of the Saint's, which some have stigmatized as weakness and imprudence, and not perhaps wholly without grounds, the very fault proves at least that he was not opposing the king in a spirit of obstinacy, or contumaciously standing out for the last iota of his claims, but rather that he stretched every point which he thought could consist with the honour of God to keep peace with his royal master—nay, on this occasion he went beyond his conscience in the effort.

The king having gained thus much from his primate, required the other bishops to follow his example, ordered the constitutions to be reduced to writing, and gave evidence that he was going to enforce them in good earnest to their fullest extent. They were read aloud, and the Archbishop for the first time mastered the extent of their evil influence. S. Thomas saw his mistake, and on the king's demanding that he and the bishops should affix their seals to the constitution, he answered at once "By the Lord Almighty, during my lifetime seal of mine shall never touch them."

As S. Thomas rode away from the court, however, wrapped in deep meditation, apart from his suite, his attendants began to talk over the events of the day, and his crossbearer, Alexander Llewellyn, expressed himself strongly to the effect that the tempest had overthrown the columns of the Church, and that during the shepherd's folly the sheep were scattered before the wolf.

"To whom does this apply, my son?" said the Archbishop. "It applies to you," replied Llewellen, "who have to-day betrayed your conscience and your fame, and in an example hateful to God, and contrary to justice, have stretched out your consecrated hands to observe impious constitutions, and have joined with wicked ministers of Satan to the overthrow of the liberty of the Church."

These words brought before the Saint his own conduct in the same feelings of keen and bitter repentance as are described in the Prince of the Apostles when he denied his Master; and scarce was he consoled by his faithful Herbert, who did all that lay in his power to assuage his grief, by reminding him of the great Scriptural penitents who rose again to yet greater faith after their fall than before. He declared himself unworthy of the sacred office he filled, interdicted himself from saying mass for 40 days, and, writing to the Pope in deepest sorrow and shame for his fault, he begged for absolution at his hands. But the king, now finding that S. Thomas had resumed his resolution, took another course to grind his opponent to the earth.

During the period of his chancellorship much, or rather the whole, of the royal treasury had been under his control. As the king's prime minister, he had regulated the payment of his troops and other expenses after wars in which Henry had been engaged, and the repairs of the fortresses and places of defence injured during the civil struggles in the reign of Stephen, and though he had lawfully accounted for all the money thus spent to the king before relinquishing his Chancellorship, Henry set to work to discover some plea by which he could allege that these moneys had not been lawfully spent, and thus inflict temporal ruin on the man whom as long as he had been his instrument, he thought he could never load with riches enough. He began by accusing S. Thomas of showing contempt of his summons when cited to answer to the charges brought against him on a certain day when the archbishop was too ill to appear. In vain the true cause was stated to the king and parliament; the latter, willing no doubt to conciliate their master, sentenced the archbishop to the confiscation of all his moveable goods, or, in other words, to a fine of £500. To this the noble and generous mind of S. Thomas, feeling that self alone would suffer the loss, at once declared that a mere question of money should never be a cause of discord between himself and his sovereign, and bail was found for payment of the sum. But the king was not going to let go his prey thus easily, and he next put forward in succession demands not only for large sums spent as chancellor in

the ways we have alluded to, but also made heavy demands on Church property and lands, and S. Thomas feeling that it was the Spouse of Christ that was now attacked in his person, thought proper to resist. It was at the Council of Northampton that these claims were urged most fully, and for the last time. For this council S. Thomas prepared with extreme solemnity. He entered the Church and said the mass of S. Stephen at the Altar of the Protomartyr with very great solemnity and devotion, his tears blinding him so much that he was obliged frequently to break off the prayers unfinished. Two things were particularly noted in this Mass by the king's party: that he had chosen one the Introit of which began with the words, "For the princes sat and spoke against me;" and that he celebrated, though it was not a festival, with his pallium, which was unusual. It also shows the conviction he had of the solemnity and awfulness of the trial he was about to go through, that he carried the Blessed Sacrament concealed on his person into the Council Chamber. The Saint would have gone to the Court vested as he came out from Mass, but that he was persuaded by some of his friends not to do so. His wish was, he said, to let the Court see who he was whom it (a lay tribunal) had twice judged. He was persuaded to lay aside his mitre and pallium; and he threw his black cappa over the sacred vestments. But this concession, small as it was, to worldly wisdom he seems to have thought too much, for on his way to the castle he said to his cross-bearer, Llewellyn, that he regretted he had not come as he at first proposed. On entering the Castle it was observed that he carried his own cross, and on some one saying to the Bishop of London, whom they met in the gateway, "My Lord of London, why do you suffer him to carry his cross?" Gilbert Foliot answered, "Good man, he always was a fool and always will be." And no doubt Gilbert was right, speaking from his own point of view; for the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light, who become fools for the kingdom of Heaven's sake.

The Bishop of Hereford then offered his services as cross-bearer, but the Archbishop declined them, and holding his cross, most truly indeed his strength and his salvation against the powers of this world and of darkness, he entered the Council Chamber. Foliot of London, apparently with instinctive uneasiness at this public manifestation of the power and authority of the Church over that of the world, said to him, "You carry your cross; now if the king were to draw his sword what hope would there be of peace?" S. Thomas replied, "If it could be so, I should wish always to carry it in my own hands; but I know what I am now doing. I would preserve

God's peace for myself and the Church in England. Say, if you like, that if you were here you would think otherwise. If my lord the king were now, as you say, to draw his sword, it would be but a bad token of peace." S. Thomas would recognize no peace that was purchased at the price of bondage for the Church of God, yet he aimed at the highest peace—Glory to God, and peace to men of good will. The Bishop of London would fain have cried peace where there was none.

The king, who on the Saint's entrance, had passed into an inner room with his barons, and had been followed by the bishops, at once took up the matter of the cross as an affront, and declared that thus carrying it (the sign of their common salvation, be it observed) was to treat him as if he were not a Christian king. The courtiers of course followed the key-note of their master, and giving the Archbishop the appellation of traitor, the murmurs and threats became so loud as to be heard in the adjacent chamber, and the most imminent personal danger to the Saint and his friends seemed impending, so much so, that he and those around him made the sign of the cross.

His faithful chaplain, Herbert de Bosham, with his characteristic ardour and impetuosity, urged him to have his sentence of excommunication ready if his person should be attacked; but Ralph Fitzstephen entreated him rather to imitate the Apostles and Martyrs, and die praying for his murderers, and when forbidden by the king's marshal to speak to the Saint, Fitzstephen made signs to him to look up at the crucifix, and occupy himself in prayer. For this piety and charity years afterwards, when S. Thomas was an exile in France, he gratefully thanked his friend, telling him how he had understood his signs, and what consolation they had brought him. And now as the threats of the courtiers and king's officers grew fiercer in the council-room, S. Thomas, stooping down, expressed his fears for his chaplain Herbert, yet told him to take heart, for that he should share in his crown of martyrdom. The intrepid Herbert replied, "We must neither of us fear, for you have raised a noble standard by which the powers not only of the earth, but of the air, are overthrown; and remember," added he, "that you were once the standard-bearer of the King of the Angles, and were never overcome: it would indeed be a disgrace to be overcome now, when you are the standard-bearer of the 'King of the Angels.'" These anecdotes will serve to show us the piety and exalted principle of at least some of the priests of an age which has been spoken of by Protestant historians as one of universal corruption and laxity amongst the clergy.

While the king and his nobles were thus preparing to accuse and pass sentence upon the Archbishop, the Bishops were holding anxious counsel, agitated with the conflicting feelings of fear of the king's wrath on the one side, and disobedience and audacity towards their Primate on the other, should they be compelled to join in the sentence. In order as they hoped to avoid both evils, they begged the king to allow them to absent themselves during the judgment on their Archbishop, offering to appease the king by appealing to Rome against him, and not to rest until he was deposed; and they told Henry how the Archbishop had appealed to Rome against their former sentences. Henry then sent some of his barons into the adjacent chamber to S. Thomas to ask whether, being his (the king's) liege subject, he dared thus appeal, and if he would give bail for the payment of the moneys claimed from him by the king, and abide by the sentence of the Court regarding the expenditure during his chancellorship. S. Thomas replied in a dignified address, in which he explained to the king that he obeyed him for God's sake in all things saving obedience to God, the Church's dignity, and the honour of a Bishop; and with graceful acknowledgments of the many honours, dignities, and offices conferred upon him by his monarch, in all of which he had served him faithfully on both sides of the Channel, he rejoiced to think that after spending all his income in the royal service he had incurred debts for the king also. He declined to be held answerable for the transactions of his chancellorship, since he was, he said, as both the king and clergy well knew—though the former now in his anger refused to admit it,—declared by the king at his election free from all secular obligations:\* that he had indeed appealed against the Bishops whom he had forbidden as his spiritual children to judge him for a secular cause which occurred before he was Archbishop; and he placed his person and the Church of Canterbury under the protection of God and the Pope.

When the king got this reply, which was received by

---

\* When Henry made his last iniquitous demand on S. Thomas that he should account for the incomes of all the vacant Bishoprics and Abbacies which had been paid into the Chancery while he was in office, Henry of Blois, the generous old Bishop of Winchester, reminded the King of the manner in which he had freed the Archbishop at his election from all secular claims, through the prince who declared it in his father's name in his, the Bishop's presence. Finding, however, that the King obstinately refused to recognize any liberation, he offered the latter two thousand marks on S. Thomas's behalf; but Henry, whose real object was to ruin his former favourite, refused them.

the fierce barons, with threats, audible to the Archbishop in the adjoining chamber, Henry urged the Bishops to join in the sentence to be pronounced against S. Thomas: but after some debate he allowed them to absent themselves, and they all rejoined the Archbishop in the ante-chamber except the Archbishop of York, who, not wishing as he said to witness the slaughter of the Primate, or perhaps frightened for his own safety, managed to withdraw altogether.

The Bishop of Chichester then addressed S. Thomas, urging him to yield, and reproaching him for going back from what he had promised at Clarendon in good faith. To which S. Thomas answered that whatever was against the Church or the laws of God could not be kept in good faith: "Furthermore," said he, "if we fell at Clarendon, for the flesh is weak, we must take courage, and in the strength of the Holy Ghost contend against the ancient enemy who is ever striving to make him fall who stands, and to prevent him from rising who has fallen. If then in the word of truth we swore to what was unjust, you know that an unlawful oath is not binding."

The Bishop of Exeter threw himself at the Saint's feet and implored him to have pity on himself and the Bishops, for the king had, he said, just decreed that any one taking S. Thomas's part should be judged guilty of high treason. "Fly hence," said the Saint to the suppliant Prelate, "for you savour not the things that be of God." After some further discussion,—in which the Bishops tried in vain to wring from the Primate permission to obey the king in being present at the sentence about to be pronounced against him,—the barons entered the apartment headed by Robert Earl of Leicester and Reginald Earl of Cornwall, and the former desired the Archbishop to hear his judgment. "Judgment!" said the Archbishop, rising up, "Son and Earl, hear me first. You know, my son, how intimate I was with our lord the king, and how faithfully I served him. It therefore pleased him that I should be advanced to be Archbishop of the Church of Canterbury. God knows I willed it not, for I knew my own weakness, and rather for the love of him than of God I gave way, which to-day is clear enough, when God and the king have both deserted me. Still in my promotion, when I was elected before Henry, the king's son and heir, the question was asked, How did they give me to the Church of Canterbury? And the answer was Free from all worldly ties. Therefore I am not bound, nor will I plead respecting them." The Earl of Leicester then declared that the Bishop of London had given a different account of this matter to the king; but urged that as the Archbishop held many castles and possessions of that monarch in



fief and barony, he did not see how he could avoid the king's judgment. The Archbishop replied that he held nothing in fief or barony, for that whatever kings gave to the Church was given as a free alms, and that the king in his privileges had confirmed the same; and he forbade the Earl of Leicester, by his sacred authority, to pass judgment upon him. The Earl, upon this, unwilling no doubt to risk his salvation to such an extent and to incur excommunication, declined proceeding further, as did the Earl of Cornwall, but they entreated the Archbishop to wait until the king's answer was brought to him. The Archbishop asked if he was a prisoner, and the Earl of Leicester swearing by S. Lazarus that he was not, S. Thomas added, "Son and Earl, yet listen. By as much as the soul is more worthy than the body, by so much are you bound to obey God and me, rather than your earthly king. Neither law nor reason permits children to judge and condemn their father. Wherefore I decline the king's judgment and yours; and under God will be judged by the Pope alone, to whom before you all I here appeal, placing the Church of Canterbury, my order, and my dignity under God and His protection. And you, my brethren and fellow Bishops, who have served man rather than God, I summon to the presence of the Pope, and so guarded by the authority of the Catholic Church and of the Holy See I go hence." And so, with all the grandeur of Apostolic dignity about him, the Saint, still bearing his Cross, left the Council Chamber. There were not wanting persons to insult him as he passed out; the de Brocs, noblemen of the worst character and reputation, and others of the king's followers, threw knots of straw and other such things after him, and one of them calling him traitor, roused the old martial spirit of S. Thomas, who turned a stern countenance upon his accuser, and said if his priesthood did not prevent him, he would defend himself in arms from their charges of purjury and treason.

In the court of the Castle he mounted his horse and rode back to the Monastery of S. Andrew, amidst the benedictions of the populace and many of the clergy, who seem to have been waiting in terror for the fate of their friend and benefactor. All as he approached raised a loud cry: "Blessed be God, who has saved his servant from the face of his enemies." So great was the throng that the Saint could hardly guide his horse and hold his cross, as he blessed the crowds who fell upon their knees as he passed. Truly it was, as he called it, a glorious procession, for, like his Divine Master, the poor were ever his special friends and care, and they dined with him that day in great numbers.



Thus ended the celebrated Council of Northampton, which took place on a Tuesday, that day of the week which always marked the chief events of S. Thomas's life.

Lingard says that it was generally believed that if the Archbishop had remained in Northampton, that night would have proved the last of his life on earth. Many well-authenticated reports as to the king's intended vengeance upon one whom he chose to account a rebel had reached S. Thomas, who took as a sort of heavenly warning a sentence which occurred in the spiritual reading during supper. It was the history of the persecution of Liberius from the tripartite Ecclesiastical history, and the words were "When they persecute you in one city fly to another." The Saint and Herbert interchanged looks, and his flight was tacitly agreed between them. This resolution seems to have been confirmed by the circumstance of S. Thomas's sending that evening the Bishops of Worcester, Hereford, and Rochester to the king, to ask for leave for S. Thomas to depart on the morrow, and a safe conduct for him to visit the Pope, when the king refused to give any answer until the next day.

Out of the forty followers who had passed into the Council Chamber with the Saint, but six remained to sit down with him to this, as it may truly be called, "Feast of the poor;" so powerful are the wishes of the rulers of this world over the hearts of the children of earth; nor must we omit the words of exhortation addressed by S. Thomas to these few faithful friends, breathing as they do the saintly spirit of the speaker at every word. "Dwell in silence and in peace," he said to them. "Let no sharp word proceed from your mouth. If any one speak against you, do not answer him, but suffer him to speak evil of you. The superior part is to suffer, the inferior so to act. We are masters of our own ears as they are of their tongues. The evil is not spoken against me; but against him who when evil is spoken recognizes it in himself."

Late at night, in darkness and a heavy rain falling, S. Thomas escaped on horseback from Northampton; the gates of which town had all been guarded by the king (no doubt to secure his captive) save one which one must think had been overlooked by a special interposition of Divine Providence Who willed that His servant's hour was not yet come. After various vicissitudes, adventures, and hair-breadth escapes, he reached Sandwich, crossed the sea in a small boat on All Souls' Day, Nov. 2nd, and landed on a part of the French coast near Gravelines, whence he proceeded, not without renewed dangers and hardships, to the Monastery of S. Bertin where Herbert and other friends joined him. His escape in safety

first through the dominions of his powerful foe Henry who had sent watchers and pursuers to all parts, and secondly through those of the Earl of Boulogne who hated him for having while Chancellor opposed a sacrilegious marriage the Earl made with the Abbess of Romsey, can hardly be regarded as less than miraculous. One of the Archbishop's followers whom he had left behind at Northampton told Herbert that he had that night a dream in which he heard a voice sing the words from the Psalm, "Our soul has escaped like a sparrow from the snare of the fowlers : our snare is broken and we are delivered."

Our present article is purely biographical and not doctrinal or historical. We will not therefore attempt, as might so easily be done, to show the vital importance towards the Church's highest interests whether of the ecclesiastical immunities,\* or of the other great principles for which S. Thomas contended. In the present age, when the course of thought is beginning to free itself from the iron cramps and fetters of the so-called Reformation, even sceptics regard the Church of the middle ages with very different eyes from the Protestant historians of the last century, and we find them speaking thus of a subject which has so excited the sectarian wrath of a Hume or a Goldsmith : "Even for what seems in the abstract a still more objectionable pretension, the claim to the exemption of ecclesiastics from secular jurisdiction, which has scandalized so grievously most of our English historians, there is much more to be said than those historians were aware of. What was it, after all, but the assertion in behalf of the clergy, of the received English principle of being tried by their peers? The secular tribunals were the courts of a rival power often in actual conflict with the clergy, always jealous of them, always ready to make use of its jurisdiction as a means of wreaking its vengeance or serving its ambition ; and were stained besides with the grossest corruption and tyranny." The same writer, Mr. Stuart Mill, speaks of the Catholic Church of the middle ages as being "the authorized champion of intelligence and self-control against military and predatory violence," and "the great improver and civilizer of Europe." Certainly

---

\* The 30th error condemned in the Syllabus is that "the immunity of the Church and of ecclesiastical persons had its origin from the civil law." The 31st that "the ecclesiastical forum for the temporal causes of clerics should be altogether abolished, even without consulting, and against the protest of, the Apostolic See." An admirable exposition of the Church's whole doctrine on the subject will be found in the fourth book of Suarez's "*Defensio Fidei Catholice*."

no one can read the letters of S. Thomas of Canterbury and the ecclesiastics of his time, without being struck with them as the compositions of men of the highest education ; while our boasted Henry Plantagenet, though no doubt better informed than most of his barons, comes out as a rough barbarian. The judicial courts of the state being therefore of the corrupt character we have described in that age, were peculiarly unfit to sit in judgment upon Churchmen. Too much had already been conceded in England by S. Thomas's predecessors ; some of whom had sought to mitigate the evil of the perpetual encroachments of the State on the Church's rights by a spirit of compromise : and it was clear to S. Thomas, on the perusal of the Constitutions of Clarendon, that if enforced they would have brought bonds and subjection to the Church. He saw that it depended on the issue of this contest as to whether the Catholic Church should continue as before to teach her children Christianity, to model their minds in the paths of piety and the highest improvement and civilization,—or become the slave of the State letting in the floods of anarchy, confusion, and schism which then especially attended temporal powers. Measures therefore so subversive of the Kingdom of Christ upon earth must be resisted unto blood.

And now that we have followed S. Thomas to this great epoch in his history we may pause to contemplate the working of God's grace on the great soul it pleased Him to call to so lofty a destiny ; for it is from this period that the real history of S. Thomas of Canterbury begins. In reading the life of this great servant of God, which is so varied in its scenes and incidents as to resemble a romance, and so mixed up with the politics both religious and secular of the age as to form a part of the History of England, we might say of Europe, we are naturally drawn to contemplate with earnest gaze the external events surrounding him who stands out as the hero of a most eventful period. And there is so much to arrest our attention and enlist our sympathy in his changeful fortunes,—so much to justify the titles of saint and martyr in his external troubles and the cause in support of which he met his death,—that we are apt to lose sight of his interior life in a greater measure than is the case in reading the life of a saint whose earthly existence was passed in scenes of a more tranquil and everyday character. Yet this is in truth the only true history of S. Thomas of Canterbury ; and it will be our wish in these pages to dwell rather on the effect produced on the mind of the Saint by the events by which he was surrounded and the trials sent by God for his greater purification, than on those

events and trials themselves, described as they have already been by so many more learned and able writers than the present.

To watch the gold of the souls of the Saints as stage after stage it is first softened by the heat of trial and grief, then melted by the fierce flames of bitterness and persecution,—different degrees in the fire of His great Crucible Who refines the souls of His Elect until they are moulded by their last deep and great suffering into the image of the Crucified,—is truly to read and contemplate the lives of Saints, and it is thus that we desire to deal with that of S. Thomas.

The sketch of this great Saint, however, which we have attempted demands so much as to cover a space quite beyond the limits of an ordinary article in a Review. We must therefore postpone the remainder of our biography to a future number, when we hope to complete our narrative with the only end which could be worthy of such a life, his Martyrdom for the Cause of the Lord he loved so well.

#### ART. IV.—DOCTRINAL APOSTOLIC LETTERS.

*The Authority of Doctrinal Decisions which are not Definitions of Faith.*  
By W. G. WARD, D. Ph. London: Burns & Oates.

*Idealism in Theology.* By H. I. D. RYDER, of the Oratory. London: Longmans.

THIS article will terminate what may be called our direct controversy with F. Ryder. The other matters to which his "Idealism" invites our attention, are in themselves of so much interest and importance, that even had he not written at all, we should undoubtedly, sooner or later, have brought them before our readers; though now, when we do so from time to time, we shall of course carefully consider his various remarks.\* But our direct controversy with him, we say, is confined to two questions: viz. (1) that of minor doctrinal judgments in general, which we treated in October; and (2) of doctrinal Apostolic Letters in particular, on which we are now to embark.

We are very far from indulging in illusions on the issue

\* We find ourselves obliged to defer our promised article on Galileo. As to F. Ryder's announced second pamphlet, we trust that whatever it contains requiring notice may be sufficiently met by Dr. Ward in a separate publication.

of the controversy. We do not expect that all even loyally-intentioned Catholics will admit, at once and as a matter of course, the substantial truth of the doctrine which we advocate. We are convinced indeed, in dealing with any individual Catholic, that nine-tenths of our task is achieved, if he can but be brought to examine the testimony and the reasoning which we adduce. For, granting the truth of Catholicism, we believe that few propositions can be named resting on more irrefragable grounds, than the general thesis which we maintain. But some not uncandid men have a real difficulty in applying themselves to the examination of our reasoning, because of their *à priori* objections,—not to the conclusion which it would recommend,—but to the fact itself of our discussing the subject. Before we proceed therefore to build on the argumentative foundation which we laid in our last number, we will consider two of these *à priori* objections; on which indeed we find that one or two excellent Catholics lay considerable stress.

Firstly then it is objected, that at a time when Catholic union is so urgently needed, it is indefensible and calamitous to sow dissensions among children of the Church, by agitating a question of so little practical importance. But we reply that we cannot at all admit the truth of the premiss here assumed: on the contrary, we hold that, in regard to educated and thinking Catholics, few questions of the day are so vital as that to which we are drawing attention. As we said in our last number (p. 373), minimism in its extreme shape,—or, in other words, that tenet which would deny the Church's infallibility in her minor doctrinal judgments,—appears to us (under the circumstances of this time), a malignant poison. Even in its more moderate form which we are to consider throughout this article—even as denying that her doctrinal judgments are very often expressed in Encyclicals and other Apostolic Letters,—it inflicts (we are convinced) serious disaster on Catholic interests. We cannot now do justice to this theme; but we may make one obvious remark. Pius IX., in the "*Quantâ curâ*," expressly tells the Church that he has chosen "*Encyclicals, Consistorial Allocutions, and other Apostolic Letters*," as his organ for condemning "the chief errors of this our most unhappy age." It cannot be a question of minor importance, whether this condemnation is liable to mistake; whether he can possibly condemn as an error what is really a truth.

A second objection refers to the effect necessarily produced on an Anglican by our doctrinal avowals. "It has always been the recognized rule of a Catholic controversialist," thus argue these objectors, "to keep altogether in the background

“(so far as is consistent with honesty) that portion of Catholic doctrine, which non-Catholics will probably misapprehend. On becoming members of the Church, they will proceed healthily from one step to another; and they will thus, ere long, view in its true colours from *within* a large body of truth, which they could not have accepted without extreme difficulty and repugnance while contemplating it from *without*. But the view of infallibility held up so conspicuously in the DUBLIN REVIEW—even if by *experience* it be found favourable to intellectual liberty—at all events, in *anticipation* presents a most different aspect; and threatens the Protestant inquirer with a heavy and intolerable yoke.”

Now to this objection it would be quite sufficient to reply, as we have already not unfrequently replied. It would suffice to say, that it is the Holy Father himself who forces this doctrine on public attention; and that so long as he continues to teach by Encyclical, Allocution, and other Apostolic Letters, no inquiring Protestant can reasonably be contented, without some distinct explanation on the authority of such pronouncements. But in real truth, as a mere matter of private judgment, we are strongly of opinion that under present circumstances great service is rendered to the Church, by forcing on the attention of externs the full doctrine of infallibility. Our reason for this opinion is the following:—

Individualism or private judgment was involved as a principle in Protestantism from the first; yet only by slow degrees has it been carried into practical effect. For some two centuries the religion of Protestants, with certain rare exceptions, was a corporate religion. In several parts of Europe latterly that truly anti-Christian maxim prevailed, “*cujus est regio ejus et religio* ;” but everywhere religion was corporate. Lutheran, Calvinistic, Zuinglian, Socinian societies differed from the Catholic Church on certain prominent tenets; and the recognized office of private judgment was to examine the foundation of these respective tenets. This task once performed, the inquirer united himself to one or other of these societies as the case might be, and adopted “*en masse*,” as a matter of course, the whole remaining assemblage of its doctrines and practices. Under such circumstances, it is plain that every wise and charitable Catholic controversialist would adapt himself to this universal habit of Protestants; he would content himself if, by any means consistent with honesty, he could prevail on them to enter the Church. It might be counted on with confidence that if they once became Catholics,



they would submit themselves without hesitation to the Church's whole body of formal and of practical teaching.

It is very evident how totally different is the present attitude of educated and thinking Protestants, and what vast strides have been made in practically applying the principle of individualism. None are, perhaps, so profoundly imbued with this principle, as those who call themselves Unionists. They seek union with the Roman Catholic Church, in the express intention of setting her magisterium at defiance; in the express intention of explaining away her definitions into accordance with their own private judgment. It would be a great calamity to the Church, that men thus minded should effect an entrance within her pale. Are you prepared, we ask them, to enter her communion, not as critics and judges, but as humble disciples? Are you prepared to comport yourselves as men who now for the first time are to learn the full truth?—as men who are to learn it, by regulating your interior life according to the rules and counsels which she will place before you, and by unreservedly surrendering yourselves to her moral and spiritual atmosphere? If you are so prepared, heartily and joyfully will her priests open to you her gates. If you are not so prepared, and until you are so prepared,—your ignorance may probably enough be invincible—but your proper place is without and not within. To become Catholics, is to live as it were in the atmosphere of infallibility; to look for direction at every moment towards the Church and the Vicar of Christ. And we consider that we have rendered important service both to the Church and to yourselves, by enlarging on the vast extent of her infallible determinations. By pondering on this fact, you will be the more easily led to apprehend the true character of that authority which she claims, and to understand how large is that surrender of private judgment, which is at once the Catholic's duty and his high privilege.

However our immediate question is, of course, not what doctrine concerning infallibility is *expedient*, but what doctrine on that subject is *true*; and we are now to prosecute that inquiry which we began in the fourth article of our October number. We there showed (p. 348) that—apart altogether from the question concerning Encyclicals and other Apostolic Letters—the Church has for many centuries been in the habit of putting forth various “minor doctrinal judgments;” i.e., judgments which condemn the contradictory tenet, not as “heretical,” but as meriting some lower censure. We added that these minor judgments have been often expressed in an affirmative as well



as in a negative shape. We pointed out that the sphere of these infallible decisions—which sphere is called in theology the “*materia fidei et morum*” (p. 294)—extends far beyond the actual and the virtual Deposit (p. 352); that it reaches all truths of whatever kind, which are directly or indirectly connected with revealed dogmata. We further stated (p. 348) that it seems to us a most convenient usage, and that we shall ourselves follow it, to use the word “dogma” exclusively for those verities which have been actually revealed; and to use the word “doctrine” in a far wider sense, as comprehending all truths infallibly taught by the Church even in matters primarily secular.\*

In regard to these “minor judgments” themselves, which are “doctrinal” but not “dogmatic,”—which condemn the contradictory tenet not as heretical but only as unsound—we arrived in October at various conclusions, to some of which we shall refer as we proceed. But the main purpose of our present article is to maintain, that these minor judgments need not be issued in the particular form of a Bull or even a Brief; that they may be contained in Encyclicals and other Apostolic Letters which are put forth with less solemnity. Or, to express the same proposition in a slightly different way, we are to maintain that the doctrinal instruction, put forth in Encyclicals and in certain other Apostolic Letters, is infallibly true. Observe, we do not say that the preambles, arguments, and obiter dicta of these Letters are infallibly true, but only the doctrinal instruction which they inculcate.

In this, as in our preceding article, we shall assume two principles, which F. Ryder holds as strongly as we do: viz. (1) that whatever infallibility is possessed by the Church, is possessed by the Supreme Pontiff; and (2) that whatever infallibility is claimed by the Supreme Pontiff, is really possessed by him. We will further remind our readers (see our last number, p. 339) that the Supreme Pontiff never formally uses this word “infallibility;” but that he is admitted by F. Ryder and by all non-Gallicans to *claim* infallibility, whenever he speaks in his capacity of Universal Teacher.

We must also be careful to premise one further remark. We were arguing, last October, against the tenet that the Church’s infallibility is confined to her definitions of faith. This tenet is contemplated expressly by approved theologians;

---

\* Pius IX. employs this distinction between *dogma* and *doctrine* in his Letter to the King of Sardinia. “It is a *dogma of faith* that Matrimony has been elevated to the dignity of a sacrament; and it is a *doctrine of the Catholic Church* that among Christians the Sacrament is of the essence of Matrimony, &c., &c.”

is denounced by all of them as theologically unsound; and by many of them as actually heretical: we spoke therefore throughout that article with considerable confidence. Now, on the present occasion also, we have a right with equal confidence to maintain our convictions, on the infallibility of the "Mirari vos" and of the "Quantâ curâ," and on certain other matters also. Still the general subject is in some sense new, since the precise marks of a minor doctrinal judgment being *ex cathedrâ* have not been (so far as we know) expressly treated in the schools. We maintain therefore several of our propositions, merely as those which appear to ourselves in greater or less degree probable. We submit the whole with sincerest deference to those many persons, who are far more thorough theologians than the present writer; and we promise that we will carefully attend to any suggestion with which they may favour us, on the various matters which we treat.

But now, even before we embark on our argument, we are met by an objection in limine. "The propositions of Encyclicals," says F. Ryder (p. 18), "do not enunciate any new truth nor even any new logical development of an old truth." Certainly this is moving the previous question with a vengeance: if they contain no new doctrinal instruction at all, it is not worth while to discuss the hypothetical question, whether if they did contain such instruction it would be infallible. Now we have admitted on various previous occasions that the use of these less solemn utterances, as vehicles of doctrinal instruction, is on the whole perhaps comparatively new, at least as regards the later centuries of ecclesiastical history. "Until recent times," says F. Knox (p. 63), "the Sovereign Pontiffs have been accustomed, as a general rule, to issue their doctrinal decrees in the form of a Bull."\* Let us confine our examination then to this simple inquiry. Have the present Pontiff and his predecessor intended to put forth doctrinal instruction, in Encyclicals or other Apostolic letters which were not Bulls? Observe, we are not as yet inquiring whether in such Apostolic letters they put forth doctrinal instruction *ex cathedrâ*, but only whether they put forth any *at all*. And to ask this question is surely to answer it. No one, be he Catholic, Protestant, or Infidel, can read Pius IX.'s "Quantâ curâ," or his Munich Brief, or his condemnation of Günther or Frohschammer, without admitting it to contain doctrinal instruction;

---

\* It would be of much service, we think, if some one of competent learning, would examine the question, to what precise extent this allegation will hold. The condemnation of Fénelon, for instance, was not by Bull.

whether he regard that instruction as true or as false. As to the "Mirari vos,"—in the "Singulari nos," issued three years later, Gregory XVI. expressly declared that in the earlier Encyclical he had intended to teach "Catholic doctrine." And indeed when first the "Mirari vos" appeared, Card. Pacca had written to Lamennais, by the Pope's express order, to inform him that this new Encyclical was intended to condemn "certain doctrines," which "had been treated and developed in the *Avenir*, and on which S. Peter's successor could not preserve silence."

There is really then nothing on earth certain, if this be not certain; if it be not certain, that Gregory XVI. conveyed certain doctrinal instruction in the "Mirari vos," and Pius IX. in various Encyclicals and other Apostolic Letters. The only question which can possibly be raised concerning either Pontiff is, whether he intended to convey such instruction in his capacity of Universal Teacher, or in some other. If in the former, it is confessedly infallible; otherwise, confessedly it does not enjoy that prerogative. This is precisely the one relevant question; and it will be the most convenient course to lay down the various propositions for which we are to argue, as so many successive theses.

One explanation should, however, be distinctly added. The Pope may, if such be his will, infallibly inculcate some doctrine on the Universal Church, not as certain but only as more probable. Such was Clement V.'s well-known declaration (Denz. n. 411), that the opinion was "more probable" of habitual grace being infused into infants in Baptism. Whether or no the Pope intends only this in a particular case, must be judged of course by the language, context, circumstances, of his declaration.

Thesis I. If an Encyclical be addressed by a Pope to all the bishops of the Church, whatever doctrinal instruction it may contain is infallibly true.

This thesis is so very evident on Catholic principles, that our only difficulty is to discover any premiss which shall be more immediately obvious than the thesis itself. If the Pope puts forth an instruction, it is either intended for certain individuals, or for the whole Church; and if intended for the latter, is infallible. But a universal\* Encyclical cannot possibly be intended for certain individuals; because the Holy Father, by addressing it to all the bishops of the Church,

---

\* It will be convenient to use the phrase "universal Encyclical," as expressing an Encyclical addressed to all Catholic bishops; and a "partial" Encyclical, as expressing one not universal.

impliedly exhorts them to inculcate this doctrine on their respective flocks. Since therefore such instruction is intended for the whole Church, it is put forth by the Supreme Pontiff as Universal Teacher, and is therefore infallible.

This reasoning is surely so simple and straightforward, that no confirmation can be needed: yet we will once more, at the risk of wearying our readers' patience, draw their attention to the "*Mirari vos*." This Encyclical in no respect differs from others as to its form and style: except indeed that it is one of the most rhetorical ever put forth; one less suggesting the idea of a doctrinal definition than, perhaps, any other which can be named.\* It *expresses* no intention whatever of obliging interior assent. Yet the whole subsequent course of ecclesiastical events in France proceeded on the basis of Gregory XVI.'s claiming infallibility for its doctrinal instruction; and in the "*Singulari nos*" he expressly declares that he had issued it as Universal Teacher. "*In which Encyclical Letter,*" he says, "*according to the duty of our office, we declared to the whole Catholic flock sound doctrine, and that which alone it is lawful to follow on the subjects mentioned therein.*" And again: "*He [Lamennais] endeavoured to overthrow the Catholic doctrine, which we defined, according to the authority committed to us unworthy [humilitati nostræ] concerning due subjection, &c., &c.*" If this particular Encyclical be thus infallible, what shadow of reason can there be for denying the same prerogative to other utterances, which are precisely similar in character? or rather indeed, which are often far more suggestive than this, of being intended as doctrinal definitions?

Again, as we shall presently show at length, it is demonstratively certain that in the "*Quantâ curâ*" Pius IX. declares himself to have spoken *ex cathedrâ* in various Encyclicals, Allocutions, and other Apostolic Letters.

How cogent is the reasoning which establishes the infallibility of doctrinal Encyclicals, will be evident from one circumstance. A vast number of objections has been made against the conclusion itself, but not one (so far as we know) against the arguments alleged in its support. Those, however, which have been made against the conclusion deserve our careful attention, and this will be the best place for considering

---

\* In January, 1865, p. 48, we ventured thus to speak of it: "There is no attempt at precise and scientific analysis, whether of the tenets condemned or of the [contradictory] truths inculcated; but rather a copious flow of rhetoric—most impressive indeed and beautiful, but still rhetoric—and a certain tone of pious excitement very different from that which pervades definitions of faith."

them. They apply, as will be seen, not to Encyclicals alone, but to all those Apostolic Letters for which we claim an *ex cathedrâ* character: and we shall therefore consider them at once in this their more general application.

Objection 1st. "It has always been the habit of Popes to "clothe in the form of a Bull every pronouncement, which is "of so solemn a character as to possess the high prerogative "of infallibility."

We will only grant for argument's sake, and not otherwise, that such a statement is universally true concerning *any* period of the Church's history; but it most assuredly is not true of *every* period. The objector himself will not maintain that dogmatic Bulls were the instruments, whereby successive Popes condemned the Arian, Pelagian, Nestorian, and Eutychian heresies; and these dogmatic definitions cannot exactly be considered as of minor importance. Göschler, in his theological dictionary, says that the issue of documents in the form of a Bull may be traced back to the time of S. Gregory the Great, and even earlier: but there was a long series of infallible Pontiffs before S. Gregory the Great. What Pontiffs did in the fourth and fifth centuries, they may do (if to them seems good) in the nineteenth: it is a simple question of *fact*, whether they *have* pronounced as Universal Teachers in a less solemn form than that of a Bull. Now, as we pointed out a page or two back, Gregory XVI., in a later Encyclical, declared almost in so many words that he had issued the "*Mirari vos*" as Universal Teacher. To disbelieve his statement, as we urged last October (p. 508), is to allege that he declared to the Universal Episcopate what he knew to be a falsehood; that falsehood being nothing less than the mendacious allegation of a pretended dogmatical fact, and the solemn promulgation of a false and spurious rule of Catholic belief. Similar remarks may obviously be made on the "*Quantâ curâ*;" and on the various "Encyclicals, Allocutions, and other Apostolic Letters," to which the "*Quantâ curâ*" refers.

Objection 2nd. "The Church's infallibility does not extend "beyond the dogmata of faith and morals; or at the utmost, "beyond strictly logical consequences deduced therefrom. But "the doctrines declared in Encyclicals and the like, are in "great degree external to that sphere; they do not therefore fall within the object-matter of infallibility."

We reasoned at length against this objector's premiss in our last number. We argued (p. 356) that "there is no class of subjects on which these later utterances pronounce, to which a parallel cannot easily be found in earlier doctrinal judgments;" that even if infallibility were confined to

doctrinal Bulls, it would still be "most evident that the Church's infallible judgments extend over a far wider sphere than the actual and virtual deposit" (p. 352).

Objection 3rd. "But these later pronouncements are not on the theological ground at all; or, at least, are only so in a very small degree. They are occupied almost exclusively with such matters as the Pope's civil principedom; or the true relations of Church and State; or the various systems of modern philosophy."

In the first place this objection somewhat overstates the matter of fact; for Christian doctrine on the Sacrament of Matrimony has been considerably illustrated by these more recent Pontifical Acts. Indeed, among the eighty propositions censured in the Syllabus, no fewer than ten offend against this very doctrine.\* But so far as the objection truly alleges facts, the "Teacher of all Christians" is pursuing that very course, which might have been expected of him under present circumstances. At this day the world in general is so indifferent to dogma, that men are not tempted to directly theological error; except indeed in those particulars, such as Matrimony, in which it bears most closely on external conduct. Otherwise they do not care enough about any dogma, to take the trouble of assailing it; because to assail it implies that they have it in their thoughts. Are you to suppose then that the unbelieving spirit is less active or less injurious than in earlier ages? Rather, as is evident, the very contrary: but that spirit will vent itself, not in *attacking* the Deposit of Faith, but in *ignoring* it; in pursuing philosophical, literary, political studies, without any reference to the light thrown on them by Revelation. Those perils then to which the Faith is now exposed, lie far more in the sphere of history, politics, and philosophy, than of theology proper. And hence it follows, that he who by Divine promise is the Church's faithful guardian against those perils, will devote his principal energy to the condemnation of religious error in things secular.

It seems not improbable that this circumstance may be the

---

\* To this extent we ourselves overstated the matter in our last number, p. 334. The reasons which have necessitated these frequent declarations on the Sacrament of Matrimony are excellently stated by F. Martin in his work on that subject, vol. ii., pp. 641-2. "In these times it is the more necessary," he says, "to hold and profess inviolately the sound and true doctrine concerning Matrimony being subject only to the Church, because many secular powers, in order to trouble the Catholic Church and injure the true religion in their territories, have with the most unjust presumption arrogated to themselves the right of enacting nefarious laws concerning marriage, &c., &c."



reason, which has induced recent Pontiffs to teach *ex cathedrâ* almost uniformly in a less solemn form than that of a Dogmatic Bull. The errors which they have to condemn are not in general directly theological, but are found for the most part on ground primarily secular.

Objection 4th. "These Acts do not purport in form and style to be doctrinal judgments at all. They are indissolubly mixed up throughout with references to passing events. Thus the 'Mirari vos' purports to be Gregory XVI.'s address to the bishops on occasion of his accession. Again, several propositions in the Syllabus are taken from Allocutions, which no one on the surface—no one who has not carefully examined their contents—would suppose to possess a doctrinal character."

Now in the first place we must protest against the relevancy of such an objection as this. If there is abundantly sufficient evidence of an instruction having been inculcated on the Church by a Pope, you have no right to reject it on some *à priori* theory, as to what dress such an instruction should wear. Even were there no precedent for this particular form of instruction, such a circumstance would be unimportant. There was a time when the Church had expressed no minor censures at all; nay, there was a time when she had issued no definitions of faith. (See our remarks last October, pp. 360–365.) Yet when definitions of faith and minor censures successively appeared, they were *ipso facto* known to be infallible, as flowing from her infallible magisterium. In the same manner, at a later period of history, the Holy Ghost for inscrutable reasons may alter the particular form in which a doctrinal instruction is delivered to the faithful.

But there is really no novelty whatever, in a doctrinal judgment being mixed up with a comment on passing events. We doubt not that students deeply versed in Ecclesiastical History will remember numerous instances of this kind. To the present writer two illustrations immediately present themselves, and he has not thought it worth while to search for more.

Illustration the first. For various reasons, no more important dogmatical definition ever issued from the Holy See than S. Leo's condemnation of the Eutychian heresy; a definition which will presently come before the reader again in a different connection. Here we observe, that on first taking it up there is nothing which leads you to expect a doctrinal definition at all; and that it is indissolubly mixed up throughout with a reference to passing events. We will give a brief analysis of its contents, that the truth of our remark may be apparent.



It is addressed to S. Flavian. The Holy Pontiff begins by expressing his surprise that S. Flavian's letter had been so long in reaching him. Now for the first time, he proceeds to say, he understands what has really taken place in the East; he sees that Eutyches is a foolish and unlearned man, who proudly refuses to learn from others wiser than himself; who does not understand the very elementary dogmata contained in the Symbol. Had he only considered three particular clauses of the Apostles' Creed, he would never have devised his heresy. S. Leo proceeds to explain how these three clauses are really inconsistent with the new heresy; but adds that even if Eutyches had so blinded himself as to be incapable of this obvious reasoning, the words of Scripture are express against him. The holy Pontiff is thus led, apparently by the mere natural course of his argument, to state scientifically that portion of Christian dogma which Eutyches assailed, and to confirm it by Scriptural testimonies. He then concludes his letter, by commenting on what had passed between his correspondent S. Flavian and the heresiarch. He expresses wonder that none of the assembled bishops had rebuked the perverse expression of doctrine which the latter had uttered; and adds that if the heretic repents, he trusts S. Flavian will press him to purge himself from the stain of this false profession. The Pontiff perceives, from the account of facts just received, that Eutyches has been latterly less attached to his heresy than he was at first; but as he refused to anathematize it, judges S. Flavian to have been quite right in condemning him. Still the heresiarch can be at once joyfully received back if he turns from his error. S. Leo concludes with mentioning by name the legates and the notary, whom he sends to the East with a view of bringing the whole matter to a good conclusion.

The dogmatic definition then, strictly so called, is embedded and involved in the general context of the Epistle, just as is the fashion of various modern Apostolic Letters. The portion extracted by Denzinger (nn. 32, 33) for its dogmatic significance, is literally less than one-seventh of the whole Letter; though we admit that that invaluable compiler might with great advantage have considerably increased his extracts. Yet this Letter, as the reader will presently see, was diligently circulated by S. Leo throughout the East and West, and universally understood as his solemn definition of Apostolic dogma.

Illustration the second. S. Hormisdas's letter to Possessor, an African bishop, is declared by F. Faure (as will be hereafter mentioned) to be one of the four most momentous ante-Tridentine definitions on the doctrines of Grace. It will be

found in Baronius, A.D. 520, nn. xvi. et seq. It so far differs indeed from S. Leo's Epistle, that it begins with promising a doctrinal response; but a less proportionate part of it is dogmatic than even of S. Leo's. In its general drift it much reminds one of those Allocutions, the immediate object of which appears (so to speak) only ecclesiastical; and in which the doctrinal judgments form an exception to the general tenor. The excesses of certain Scythian monks seem the main thing which occupied the Pontiff's mind; and, indeed, Pagius thus speaks, in his notes on the passage of Baronius: "Possessor's letter," says Pagius, "found Hormisdas in a bitter state of mind towards the monks, justly indignant as he was at their recent departure. Consequently, in the former part of his answer to Possessor he uttered large invectives against the monks."

Objection 5th. "It is admitted by all that no Pontifical Act "is infallible in its preamble, its arguments, its obiter dicta. "But who is to decide for us in any given case what are its "arguments and its obiter dicta? Each man's private judgment. Surely it is incredible that there can be a pronouncement *ex cathedrâ*, on which there may be an honest difference "of opinion as to what is, and what is not, infallibly pronounced."

This is the last general objection which we shall have to consider; and its treatment will occupy a larger space than that of the preceding. We reply to it, firstly, as to the preceding objection. If there is abundantly sufficient evidence of an instruction having been inculcated on the Church by a Pope, you have no right to reject it on some *à priori* theory, as to what dress such an instruction should wear.

Secondly, we consider that the objection greatly overstates facts. For instance: there is perhaps no Pontifical Act which presents so much difficulty as the "*Mirari vos*," to those desirous of knowing the precise extent reached by its definitions. Yet no one can doubt, at all events, that the opinion is therein condemned, which would account liberty of worship and of the press as a positive good; nor, again, can any one doubt that Gregory XVI. represents liberty of the press as a serious calamity, in that shape in which it now so widely exists throughout the civilized world. So much on the "*Mirari vos*." But in the great majority of cases there is no difficulty whatever in knowing what the Holy Father pronounces. How singularly harmonious and consistent, e.g., is Pius IX.'s whole teaching on the necessity of his civil principedom! Some few Catholics (alas!) doubt the *infallibility* of that teaching, but there is no second opinion on its *purport*. Or, take the

various philosophical instructions—such as the condemnation of Hermes or of Fröhschammer—you may recalcitrate against the Pope's doctrine, but you cannot possibly doubt what he means. In particular, we would refer to the "*Gravissimas inter*" (Recueil, p. 466) which condemns Fröhschammer. If words of praise may be permitted where speaking of that which is infallible, we should point out that the matter in hand is one of uncommon difficulty; and we should ask how that matter could imaginably be handled after a fashion, more exhaustive and at the same time more unmistakably intelligible. Lastly, the "*Quantâ curâ*" proceeds from beginning to end on so orderly and methodical an arrangement, that nothing can be more so. As a whole, in fact, the "*Quantâ curâ*" has far more the appearance of a doctrinal definition, than has S. Leo's Dogmatic Letter. Nor can any one have the slightest difficulty in distinguishing its instructions from its preamble, its arguments, and its obiter dicta.

Thirdly, we do not deny that in a few particular cases there may really be a fair and reasonable doubt, whether this or that given proposition is an instruction or an obiter dictum; or again whether the Pope teaches it as certain, or only as probable. But there is one excellent purpose, at all events, which may imaginably be promoted by this circumstance; viz., moral probation. Take a parallel case. Not unfrequently the path of duty is really hard to find, however honest and straightforward the intention. And it is a commonplace to point out, that often this very perplexity constitutes a moral probation. So in such cases as we have supposed. A Catholic is not under a peremptory obligation, but is called on to exercise a wise discretion. How powerfully may the exercise of this discretion affect the character for good or evil! Suppose two Catholics circumstanced according to the above description. One puts aside, to the utmost of his power, all bias and prejudice, and supplicates for grace to aid him in the attempt; he applies himself exclusively to examine what the Church teaches or indicates. The other is satisfied with ascertaining that the Church's voice is not *unmistakably* against his own inclination, and troubles himself no further in the matter. The former will have made an important stride in the increase of docility and of a Catholic spirit; the other will have failed in that precise probation, with which it has pleased God to visit him.

Fourthly, we altogether deny that this objection, whatever its value, tells exclusively against those more modern Pontifical Acts which we are here treating. F. Tanner, S.J., lived two centuries ago; and yet F. Ryder himself (p. 70) has given an extract from him which abundantly evinces the truth of our

remark. "If the Pontiff," says that theologian, "puts forth any decree in the materia of faith as Pastor of the Church, we must *diligently examine*—from the circumstances, the words of the decree, the occasion of writing, the question proposed,—on *what it is which* the Pontiff intends directly to determine." He must be understood not to decide a question *ex cathedrâ* "as often as it may be *inferred from the words and circumstances* that he is only expressing his private judgment or proposing something merely as the more probable doctrine. In estimating which matter *both the judgment of the learned and the sense and consent of the faithful count for a great deal.*" You see he mentions this difficulty—the difficulty of ascertaining the precise proposition or propositions infallibly condemned—not as a rare, but rather as the ordinary circumstance: and yet F. Ryder could not himself express the difficulty more strongly, as applicable to a modern Encyclical or other Apostolic Letter. Fortified then by Tanner's authority, we do not think it worth while to search for precedents; though we doubt not that such might most easily be found.

We now add finally that the objection before us implies a premiss, (which on other grounds altogether) cannot possibly be conceded. It implies that doctrinal determinations must always be clear and unmistakable; that there can never be honestly any very wide divergence on their true interpretation. But this premiss, we say, cannot possibly be maintained. We will not attempt to treat so large a subject episodically, but we will mention one obvious instance to the contrary which at once presents itself. The Church infallibly teaches "*Nemo habet de suo nisi mendacium et peccatum*" (Conc. Araus, canon 22; Denz., n. 165). Now it is really difficult to exaggerate the divergence which exists among orthodox and pious theologians, on the meaning of this determination. What increases the difficulty is the 38th condemned proposition of Quesnel: "*Peccator non est liber nisi ad malum, sine gratiâ Liberatoris.*" We are very far from denying that a doctrine can be drawn out, which shall fully harmonize with these two infallible decisions: but certain it is that theologians, perfectly honest and loyal to the Church, differ from each other most widely on the interpretation to be given them.

We have now, therefore, considered all the objections which have been suggested to us by others, or which occur to our own mind, as telling against the infallibility, both of Encyclicals, and of those other Apostolic Letters to which we ascribe that prerogative. One objection still remains to be

treated, which tells, not against the infallibility of universal Encyclicals, but against that of all Apostolic Letters which are not formally addressed to the whole Church. We will not, however, state at length this objection, until we have expressed our various remaining theses, and adduced the positive arguments on which they respectively rest.

Thesis II. Every doctrinal Act is *ex cathedrâ*, which issues officially from the Supreme Pontiff, and is headed "in perpetuam rei memoriam," or appears in some similarly general form.

Such are three Acts among those from which the Syllabus was compiled: viz., the "*Multiplices inter*," June 10, 1851; "*Ad Apostolicæ*," August 25, 1851; and "*Cùm Catholica*," March 26, 1860. Such, again, was Gregory XVI.'s condemnation of *Hermes*. And the reason of our thesis is most evident. If the Holy Father puts forth any given doctrinal instruction, it must be intended either for some particular persons or for the Universal Church. But in this case no particular persons are even hinted at; and the other alternative therefore necessarily follows.

Thesis III. The Syllabus of December 8, 1864, furnishes an infallible Rule of belief.

There are some theologians, we understand, holding heartily the same general opinions that we ourselves follow, who doubt whether the Syllabus, when first issued, was certainly infallible. We cannot but distrust our own judgment, where it is opposed to theirs; yet we confess we have never been able to understand their position. The Syllabus was sent round to all Catholic bishops by the Pope's command, for the express purpose of serving as a guide to their teaching. We never understood how the Universal Teacher could possibly so act, without guaranteeing the truth of what was thus encyclically addressed.

But at the present time there is no need of considering this question; and these very theologians admit that the infallibility of the Syllabus is *now* beyond the possibility of question. As we have repeatedly pointed out, so soon as the Syllabus appeared, various bishops declared confidently, and as a matter of elementary principle, that it was to be accepted by all Catholics as an infallible guide. The Cardinal Vicar of Rome, addressing under the Pope's eye the Pope's own diocese, headed the list. No bishop was to be heard on the other side even in a whisper. Had all this been a delusion, Pius IX., by keeping silence, would have been guilty of no less a crime than this: he would have connived at a false rule of belief being promulgated in his name, and

would have been the accomplice of sacrilegious deception under shelter of his very office as Universal Teacher. But he did not even keep silence. On June 17, 1867, he both authenticated the Syllabus as having come from him, and expressly confirmed it. "In the Encyclical of 1864," he said to the bishops, "and in that which is called the Syllabus, I declared to the world the dangers which threaten society, and I condemned the falsehoods which assail its life. That act I now confirm in your presence, and I set it again before you as the rule of your teaching." We quote from the Archbishop's Pastoral Letter on the Centenary (pp. 6, 7). We are bound indeed to add his Grace's statement, that the words "were unfortunately not taken down;" but he adds that they ran "as nearly as possible" in the form which he gives. We have already said that even had the Holy Father been *silent* after the various Episcopal utterances, there could have been no possible doubt on the infallibility of the Syllabus; and what therefore can be alleged, after this express declaration?

We lay particular stress, moreover, on what was declared by the Cardinal Vicar of Rome. Speaking of both Encyclical and Syllabus, he said:—"The faithful who show themselves such in word and act recognise in the voice of the Church's visible head *the very Word of God*. . . . That head has authority to address the whole Church; and he who listens not to him declares himself as no longer appertaining to the Church, as no longer making part of Christ's flock, and, accordingly, as *no longer having a right to the eternal inheritance of Heaven*." Such was the doctrine inculcated on the Holy Father's immediate children, on the local Church of Rome. Now every one knows what special authority is ascribed by Fathers and theologians to the Church of Rome. Such is the language alike of earlier and of later centuries. With this Church, says S. Irenæus, because of her position of superiority, all other Churches must be in agreement. "In which" Roman Church, says Pius IX. (Encyclical, "*Noscitis et nobiscum*") always remains the infallible magisterium of the Faith, and in which therefore Apostolic Tradition has always been preserved." And in October, 1865 (p. 391, note; Dr. Ward's "*Doc. Dec.*," p. 136) we drew attention to a passage of Delahogue, quoted with warm approbation by Dr. Murray, on the peculiar authority of Roman theologians—far pre-eminent over that of all others—in testifying pure tradition. Now Cardinal Patrizi derived his strong judgment on the authority of such a document as the Syllabus, either from the Holy Father's "*vivum oraculum*," or else from the endemic tradition of the



Roman Church. On either hypothesis it possesses a weight hardly inferior to that of infallibility. And moreover, which is still more important, Pius IX. gave his implied sanction to the judgment, by permitting without disapproval his own immediate flock to be thus instructed.

Thesis IV. All the Pontifical Acts from which the Syllabus was compiled, were issued *ex cathedrâ*.

We argued for this thesis in our last number, pp. 286, 7. But we think that the relevance of our arguments will be still more clearly exhibited, and other incidental advantages also gained, if we reprint the commencement of the "*Quantâ curâ*."

With how great care and pastoral vigilance the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, fulfilling the duty and office committed to them by the Lord Christ Himself in the person of most Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, of feeding the lambs and the sheep, have never ceased sedulously to nourish the Lord's whole flock with words of faith and with salutary doctrine, and to guard it from poisoned pastures,—is thoroughly known to all, and especially to You, Venerable Brethren. And truly the same, Our Predecessors, asserters as they were and vindicators of the august catholic religion, of truth, and of justice, being specially anxious for the salvation of souls, had nothing ever more at heart than by their most wise Letters and Constitutions to unveil and condemn all those heresies and errors which, being adverse to our Divine Faith, to the doctrine of the catholic Church, to purity of morals, and to the eternal salvation of men, have frequently excited violent tempests, and have miserably afflicted both Church and State. For which cause the same Our Predecessors, have, with Apostolic fortitude, constantly resisted the nefarious enterprises of wicked men, who, like raging waves of the sea foaming out their own confusion, and promising liberty whereas they are the slaves of corruption, have striven by their deceptive opinions and most pernicious writings to raze the foundations of the catholic religion and of civil society, to remove from among men all virtue and justice, to deprave the mind and judgment of all, to turn away from true moral training unwary persons, and especially inexperienced youth, miserably to corrupt such youth, to lead it into the snares of error, and at length tear it from the bosom of the catholic Church.

But now, as is well known to You, Venerable Brethren, already, *scarcely had we been elevated to this Chair of Peter* (by the hidden counsel of divine Providence, certainly by no merits of Our own), when seeing with the greatest grief of Our soul a truly awful storm excited by so many evil opinions, and [seeing also] the most grievous calamities never sufficiently to be deplored which overspread the Christian people from so many errors, *according to the duty of Our Apostolic Ministry, and following the illustrious example of Our Predecessors*, We raised Our voice, and in many published *Encyclical Letters and Allocutions delivered in Consistory, and other Apostolic letters, we condemned the chief errors of this Our most unhappy age*, and we excited your admirable Episcopal vigilance, and we again and again



admonished and exhorted all sons of the catholic Church, to Us most dear, that they should altogether abhor and flee from the contagion of so dire a pestilence.

It is demonstratively certain from these words, that Pius IX. has put forth *ex cathedrâ* "many published Encyclical Letters, and Consistorial Allocutions, and other Apostolic Letters." For (1) he expressly states that in them he was warning "*all the sons of the Church*" against doctrinal error; and (2) he parallels these letters in character to those "most wise Letters and Constitutions," whereby his various predecessors "unveiled and condemned *heresies* and errors adverse to our Divine Faith, to the doctrines of the Catholic Church, to purity of morals, and to the eternal salvation of men."

Now take the first sentence of Cardinal Antonelli's Circular:—

Our Holy Father, Pius IX., Sovereign Pontiff, being profoundly anxious for the salvation of souls and for sound doctrine, has never ceased *from the commencement of his Pontificate* to proscribe and condemn the *chief errors and false doctrines of our most unhappy age*, by published *Encyclicals, and Consistorial Allocutions, and other Apostolic Letters*. But as it may happen that all the Pontifical Acts do not reach each one of the ordinaries, the same Sovereign Pontiff has willed that a Syllabus of the same errors should be compiled, to be sent to all the bishops of the Catholic world, in order that these bishops may have before their eyes all the errors and pernicious doctrines which he has reprobated and condemned.

In the "*Quantâ curâ*" then, Pius IX. declares that in "many published Encyclical Letters and Consistorial Allocutions and other Apostolic Letters he condemned the chief errors of our most unhappy age": and Cardinal Antonelli repeats after him the self-same words. The latter proceeds to say that a Syllabus of errors has been compiled *from these Acts*. It is undeniable therefore, that those Acts which Pius IX. mentions in the "*Quantâ curâ*" are those from which the Syllabus was compiled; and we have already seen how absolutely certain it is that those Acts which Pius IX. mentions in the "*Quantâ curâ*" were delivered *ex cathedrâ*.

At all events, Card. Antonelli, writing by the Pope's command, expressly says that in those various Acts from which the Syllabus was compiled, the Pontiff had been "condemning the chief errors and false doctrines of the age." How is it possible that such Acts can have been issued by him in any other capacity than that of Universal Teacher?

A still stronger argument for our thesis—if indeed a stronger argument be possible—was another which we stated

in October. We here assume, of course, that the Syllabus is infallible; and the question therefore to be considered is simply this: Did the Pope issue the Syllabus for the purpose of pronouncing, on some of the denounced errors, a more authoritative and irreformable condemnation than they had hitherto received? Or did he issue it, merely in order that the condemnation, which had *already* been pronounced, might become more generally known and more distinctly understood? All our readers must agree with us, that the Cardinal's words just quoted are as plain as any words can possibly be in favour of the latter alternative.

At the same time this reasoning does not oblige us to deny a proposition, which on other grounds seems *undeniable*. There are one or two Pontifical Acts, we think, in regard to which it would not have been at all certain without the Syllabus that they were intended to convey this or that particular doctrinal instruction. The very purpose of Pius IX. in issuing the Syllabus, would seem to have been, that there might be (1) a more extensive, and (2) a more certain knowledge among Catholics, what errors he had already condemned *ex cathedrâ*. There is much to be said in illustration of this proposition, for which we have here no space.

Thesis V. Every Allocution or other Apostolic Letter\* officially issued by the Holy Father, and containing doctrinal instruction, is to be accounted *ex cathedrâ* if he himself commands its publication.

If the Supreme Pastor addresses officially a doctrinal letter to one or more individuals, he must do so for one of two purposes; either that of merely instructing those individuals, or that of instructing the Universal Church. If it is intended for the latter purpose, it is put forth by him as Universal Teacher, *i.e.*, *ex cathedrâ*; but not if it is intended for the former. Now, if the Holy Father writes to individuals merely for their personal instruction, of course there is no secret in the matter, and the Letter becomes generally known: †

---

\* We have Pius IX.'s authority, in the passage above cited from the "*Quantâ curâ*," for including "Allocutions" under the general term "Apostolic Letters."

† We have nowhere seen more clearly expressed the weight of those official doctrinal utterances of Popes which are *not ex cathedrâ*, than by F. Martin, S.J., in his work on Matrimony, vol. ii., p. 482. He speaks of those "testimonies and declarations which the Supreme Pontiffs have uttered at different times, *not as teaching solemnly ex cathedrâ* nor as defining doctrine and inculcating it on the belief of all the faithful; but, nevertheless, as Holy Pontiffs exercising their supreme office of teaching and confirming [in the Faith] whether the faithful or the pastors themselves, of defending and protecting true doctrine, and of correcting errors. Whence these testimonies and

yet its publication takes place by the mere force of circumstances. But if the Pontiff himself *commands* its publication and promulgation, what else can be understood by this circumstance, except that he does not intend it for those only to whom it is addressed, but for the Universal Church?\*

Indeed, as we pointed out in our last number, there is a sentence in the Allocution, "*Ubi primum*" (Recueil, p. 208), which almost says in so many words that the command of publication invests any Pontifical utterance with the Encyclical character. "Since we have resolved," says Pius IX., "to publish this our Allocution, on this occasion we address our discourse to our other Venerable Brethren also, the *Patriarchs Archbishops, and Bishops of the whole Catholic world.*" By the very fact of publication then he addresses the Universal Episcopate.

This we give as the direct argument for our thesis: but there is a corroboration which should not be omitted. In the paragraph already cited from the "*Quantà curâ*," Pius IX. unites all the Apostolic Letters for which he implicitly claims infallibility, under the common category of "*having been published*" by him. "*Pluribus in vulgus editis Encyclicis, &c., errores damnavimus.*" Indeed we may submit, as we did in an earlier number, whether the more natural translation of these words would not be "*by publishing Encyclicals, &c., we condemned, &c.*"

It remains then under this head, to explain what is meant precisely by that "command of publication" on the Pope's part, which should be taken to indicate his intention of addressing the Universal Church. Under present circumstances this condition seems fulfilled, when the Holy Father publicly announces his utterance of some Act; commands it to be printed; and secures its being readily obtainable by all who desire to see it. Cardinal Antonelli, in the letter which we have so often quoted, speaks of it as a kind of accident that all these Acts do not reach all the bishops. "*It may happen,*" he says, "*that all the Pontifical Acts do not reach*

---

declarations are such, that by them is expressed the mind, sense, and consistent teaching of the Holy Pontiffs, *not as private doctors, but as Holy Pontiffs*;—teaching at one time this or that individual layman or bishop, at another some particular Church; declaring some truth as *already fixed and determined* either by some antecedent definition or by the habitual teaching [of the Holy See]."

\* F. Perrone implies this principle, *De Matrimonio Christiano*, vol. ii., p. 372, note. He contrasts two letters of Pius VI.,—one to the Archbishop of Malines, the other to the Bishop of Motola,—in that "*the former was sent to a private bishop; but the Pope publicly promulgated his Brief,*" addressed to the Bishop of Motola.

each one of the ordinaries." But before the invention of printing, some more active measures of circulation were doubtless needed; such as we shall presently see to have been adopted by S. Leo, in the case of his Dogmatic Letter to S. Flavian.

Thesis VI. A doctrinal Apostolic Letter, addressed to one or more individuals, is infallible in its doctrinal instruction, whenever it is evident from the circumstances that such instruction is not intended for the special benefit of those formally addressed.

It is plain that this fact may often enough be evident from circumstances. Thus, in October, 1865 (pp. 383-5; Dr. Ward on "Doctrinal Decisions," pp. 124-127), we drew a contrast in this respect between a letter addressed in the year 748 by Pope Zachary to S. Boniface, and that addressed in 1857 by Pius IX. to the Archbishop of Cologne. You see at once on reading the former letter, that it is intended specially for the personal instruction of S. Boniface; whereas it would be not less than grotesquely absurd, to suppose that Pius IX. intended specially to instruct the Archbishop of Cologne. Pius IX. expresses confidence in the Archbishop's orthodoxy, and proceeds to denounce Günther's errors. Which of the two then was he specially intending to instruct? Contrast this with instances of an opposite character, and the force of our remark will become apparent. We spoke just now of Zachary's letter to S. Boniface: but a still stronger instance will be found in Nicholas's instruction to the Bulgarians, of which we spoke in our last number, p. 488; for here is even a more unmistakable instance of instruction being given to those who specially needed it. In like manner, as to the instruction given by Eugenius IV. to the Armenians, on which F. Ryder speaks from p. 20 to p. 23—whether this be or be not *ex cathedrâ*—at all events it has not that *mark* of an *ex-cathedrâ* utterance which we are here urging. It is an instruction given to those who specially needed it.\*

---

\* In July last (p. 161) occurs the following passage:—"Nor shall we include among our topics F. Ryder's comment on the 'instruction to the Armenians,' because that argument was answered by anticipation (though not by Dr. Ward) in our number for January, 1866." To which a note was appended, saying, "we are well aware that there are other theological difficulties connected with this instruction besides that mentioned by F. Ryder."

There is a certain awkwardness in expressing what is here meant, because of a Review's corporate character: but Dr. Ward is inclined to the opinion (though he speaks with great diffidence, and is well aware how many theologians speak differently) that this instruction was addressed to the Armenians in particular, and *not* to the Church in general. At the same time he

Now the argument for our present thesis is simply this. If a doctrinal instruction is formally addressed by the Supreme Pontiff to one or more individuals,—and yet is not specially intended for their benefit,—for whose benefit *is* it intended? What answer can be given, except that the Teacher of all Christians intended it for the *benefit* of all Christians? For the benefit, *i.e.*, of all those throughout the Church who may need it; for the benefit of all those throughout the Church who might otherwise fall into the errors which it condemns. But if he do so intend it, it is *ex cathedrâ*.

Thesis VII. Let us suppose that some given doctrinal tenet is notoriously held by one or more individuals in this or that portion of the Church; and let us further suppose that an Apostolic Letter (however formally addressed), in express or equivalent terms, authoritatively pronounces this tenet heretical or unsound. Such pronouncement is *ex cathedrâ* and infallible.

This is substantially Dr. Murray's thesis, vol. iii., p. 782. Its truth seems to us evident on two different grounds. Firstly, the Holy Father cannot authoritatively pronounce a tenet unsound, except in his capacity of Universal Teacher. Doubtless a private theologian will often say that such a tenet *seems* to him deserving of this or that censure; and doubtless also, if the case could be supposed of a Pope in some official letter speaking thus opinatively, that letter would probably not be *ex cathedrâ*. But to express his *opinion* that a tenet is unsound, is fundamentally different from authoritatively *pronouncing* it so to be.

Secondly, in every official letter declaring some doctrine to be certain, the Pope must be doing one of two things: he must be either intending to determine this doctrine for the whole Church, or else to instruct individuals in the doctrine *universally received* as certain. But on the present hypothesis the latter cannot possibly be his intention; because our very supposition is, that the doctrine he is delivering is *not* at this moment thus universally received.

From this consideration, though it stood alone, you might confidently infer that Pius IX. spoke *ex cathedrâ* in his declaration to the King of Sardinia, that among Christians the

---

holds most strongly that the answer given to the Union Reviewer in our pages of January, 1866 (pp. 282-284), is abundantly satisfactory. Indeed a considerable proof of this is found in the circumstance that no rejoinder was ever made. The writer in the *Union Review* misapprehended the meaning of what had been said in our pages, and this we pointed out in the following April (pp. 549, 550); but when we had corrected his misapprehension, he remained silent.

marriage-contract is inseparable from the marriage-sacrament. "It is a *dogma of faith*," he says, that Matrimony is a sacrament; and "*a doctrine of the Catholic Church*" that among Christians this sacrament is of the very essence of marriage. He calls this a "*doctrine of the Catholic Church*"; and by so calling it, implies of course a censure of its contradictory.

More than a year ago (Oct. 1866, pp. 515-517) we quoted in defence of this thesis the authority of Benedict XIV., probably as a private theologian, and quite certainly as Universal Teacher. A writer in the "*Analecta Juris Pontificii*" thinks it probable that in the former capacity he was author of a little work entitled, "*Epistola Gratulatoria, &c.*"; and the Brief "*Ad eradicandum*" was undoubtedly issued by him *ex cathedrâ*. We cannot do better, we think, than reprint the whole of our remarks.

Several priests in Portugal had been in the habit of requiring penitents, as a condition for Absolution, to reveal the name of their accomplices in sin. On July 7, 1745, Benedict XIV. addressed the Apostolic Letter "*Suprema*" to the bishops of Portugal, gravely reprehending this practice and the doctrinal error which it implied. This was followed in June, 1746, by the Brief "*Ubi primum*"; and in the following October by the Brief "*Ad eradicandum*." The "*Epistola Gratulatoria*" was written in the interval between the first and last of these three pronouncements. An objection had widely prevailed, that Benedict XIV.'s original censure, having been merely addressed to the *local Church* of Portugal, was *not ex cathedrâ* and infallible. The passage to which we would draw attention replies to this objection, and is literally translated as follows:—

I would inquire of these chatterers what it is to define *ex cathedrâ*; for from their way of speaking I suspect that they do not know: and I will say briefly. The Pontiff is *then* said to define *ex cathedrâ*, as often as, in his capacity of the Church's Supreme Pastor and Universal Teacher, he proposes and appoints something to be observed, avoided, or believed; and informs and instructs all Christ's faithful concerning some dogma. But now these sciolists foolishly prattle (*nugantur*) that I have fallen upon Scylla, and they turn round on me, because, as they say, the Holy Father directed his letter, not preceptive but monitory, *not [as intended] for the Universal Church, but for the kingdom of Portugal alone, and to its bishops*. I am covered with humiliation because men, commonly accounted learned, are not ashamed of being as foolish as the multitude (*apud indoctos desipere*), and to intersperse their articulate words with *these foolish whispers*. How far astray are they led by their boastfulness and obstinacy! When the Holy Father teaches the bishops of Portugal concerning dogmata and the necessary administration of



Sacraments, *does he not also instruct the Universal Church?* Is the Faith, is the necessary ministration of the Sacrament of Penance, is the necessity of the Sacramental sigillum, *one thing in Portugal, another thing in other parts of the world?* Because the Holy Father addresses his rescript to these or those bishops [in particular,] in that he knows *them* to need his admonition or teaching; *is he not to be counted as having addressed them to all who need the same admonition and teaching?* The Apostle teaches us of one Body, one Spirit, one Faith, one Baptism, and consequently one Sacrament of Penance which John had proclaimed. Therefore one and the same obligation of the Sacramental sigillum which is urged (commendatur) on some bishops *should be accounted as prescribed to all.* This necessity of the sacred sigillum is perceived [at once] as appertaining, not to discipline, which it will be lawful to observe differently in different provinces, but to *Christ's institution*; to the intrinsic substance of the Sacrament; to the universal benefit of the faithful; and consequently to *infallible dogma.*

Now we need not necessarily understand this to mean, that the Pope is promised infallibility whenever he officially instructs some local Church in Christian doctrine. But the following view at least is indubitably advocated: "Whenever a Pope, writing officially to some local Church or individual bishop, brands any existing practice or tenet with a *theological censure*, he is understood by that very fact to teach *ex cathedra.*" And, whoever may be the author of this "*Epistola Gratulatoria*," an extremely strong confirmation of such a view is derived from the following circumstance. The Brief "*Ad eradicandum*," which was undoubtedly issued after the "*Epistola*" had appeared, contains the following passage:—

We are not ignorant that in other places also complaints of penitents have been heard, concerning the importunate inquiries of certain confessors concerning the names of accomplices and other information, according to the practice mentioned and condemned in Our [previous] Apostolic Letter. [Nor are we ignorant] that the erroneous opinions of certain doctors on this head,—and [again] the wrong interpretation and application of [what has been said by] other doctors who are themselves right thinking—which was mentioned in that letter, [still] find favour with some; and are not considered to have been sufficiently exterminated by the aforesaid Letter: concerning which *it has been temerariouly denied by some that it possesses the force and authority of a general definition and law*, on the ground that it was addressed to the peculiar circumstances (opportunitatem) of Portugal, its kingdoms and dependencies, and only published for them. Therefore We, motu proprio, and from certain knowledge, by the tenour of this Our General Sanction, and from the plenitude of Our Apostolical Power confirming and corroborating Our [previous] letter, decree and declare that the above-mentioned practice *was* reprobated and condemned by Our Apostolic authority *in itself, and for all places and times, and so ought to be accounted.*



Here Benedict XIV. declares *ex cathedrâ*, in terms which cannot be mistaken, that an Apostolic Letter, addressed formally not to the Universal Church but to the Bishops of Portugal, was nevertheless issued *ex cathedrâ*, and possessed "the force and authority of a *general definition*."

Thesis VIII. A Pontifical Act, containing doctrinal instruction, is *ex cathedrâ*, if it contains such words as "*motu proprio*," "*ex certâ scientiâ*," "*ex plenitudine potestatis*," and the like.

This test is laid down by F. Schröder; and we merely state it on his authority, submitting its truth to the judgment of theologians. See our number for April, 1867, p. 522. F. Schröder's ground must be as follows. If, in delivering a doctrinal instruction, the Supreme Pontiff uses words so solemn as these, he equivalently declares that he is investing that instruction with the fullest authority of which it is capable. F. Ryder indeed alleges (p. 25) that Pontiffs "frequently refer to the infallible Chair of Peter as their great claim to a respectful hearing, even when speaking on matters on which they are certainly not pretending to speak infallibly." But he has not given one instance in support of his allegation.

We here close the statement and proof of our successive theses. Against the five last of them one objection is adducible, which some few Catholics feel very strongly. Otherwise we are not aware of any difficulties in the way of the last five, which would not equally avail against the three former; and we have already considered all these difficulties, so far as we know of them or can imagine them.

The objection in question is founded on a dictum ascribed to theologians, to the effect that the Holy Father is never infallible unless he is formally addressing the whole Church. Now, even if we granted for argument's sake—we would not possibly grant it otherwise—that any theologian ever intended to say this,—even on such a supposition the testimony of such theologian would have to be put aside. It is for the *Ecclesia Docens*, and not for theologians, to determine the conditions of infallibility; and the *Ecclesia Docens* decisively contradicts the above-named premiss. We will not here refer to S. Leo's Dogmatical Letter, and to other instances which we are presently to consider in a somewhat different connection: we will speak of modern declarations alone. Thus the "*Quantâ curâ*," as we have already seen, states beyond the possibility of doubt that Pius IX. has spoken *ex cathedrâ* in "many Encyclicals and Consistorial Allocutions and other Apostolic Letters." Now universal Encyclicals are formally addressed to the whole Church: but neither partial Ency-

clicals nor other Apostolic Letters are so addressed. Supposing then there were any truth whatever in the objector's premiss,—the Pontiff would, of course, have drawn a broad distinction, between universal Encyclicals on the one hand and all other Apostolic Letters on the other. But in fact he does not even hint at any distinction between universal and partial Encyclicals; and he mentions Encyclicals, Allocutions, and other Apostolic Letters, as all alike *ex cathedrâ*.

Further: the reader has already seen that the Acts to which this sentence refers are precisely those on which the Syllabus is founded. Now, how many of these Acts are in form universal Encyclicals? One *and one only*; viz., the "*Qui pluribus*" issued Nov. 9, 1846, on occasion of Pius IX.'s accession. The "*Maxima quidem*," indeed, of June 9, 1862, may in some sense be called a universal Encyclical, because it was addressed directly to the multitude of bishops at that time assembled in Rome. But the remaining Acts to which the Syllabus refers are thus enumerated. There are four partial Encyclicals; two addressed to the bishops of Italy, one to those of Austria, and one to those of New Grenada: three Constitutions, headed "*in perpetuam rei memoriam*": seventeen Allocutions: six Letters to individual bishops: one Letter to the King of Sardinia. It is but a small minority then of these infallible pronouncements, which are formally addressed to the Universal Church.

Lastly, remember the Episcopal Address presented at Rome last July. We dwelt on this in our last number from p. 528 to p. 532. As we mention in p. 532, the bishops virtually state that the number of *ex cathedrâ* Acts is very large which have been issued by the Holy Father within the last five years: it is impossible then that they can have been speaking exclusively of those comparatively few doctrinal and universal Encyclicals, which have been published during that period.

However, let us consider what is really the language of theologians. They say that the Pontiff is never infallible, unless when he is addressing the whole Church. Now in one sense this proposition is so indubitable, as to be almost a truism; while in another sense it is so undeniably false, that not a word can be said in its defence: and it is only when understood in the latter sense, that it has even the superficial appearance of contradicting our theses. If any theologian had really said that the Pope is only infallible when *formally* addressing the whole Church, he would have said what is monstrously false on the very surface. A pronouncement may be formally addressed to the whole Church, either by being addressed to all her bishops—like Martin V.'s "*Inter cunctas*"

and Gregory XVI.'s "Mirari vos"—or else by being addressed to all her faithful, like the "Unigenitus" and the "Auctorem Fidei." Now, it is enough to say (as we observed in our last number, p. 504) that if no utterances except these are *ex cathedrâ*, then the Immaculate Conception has never been defined to this day.

It is in quite a different sense then, that theologians intend the above-named proposition: they mean merely that the Pope is never infallible, unless when he *intends to instruct* the Universal Church. But there is not even a moment's plausibility in such a notion, as that the Pope cannot intend to instruct the Universal Church in Letters formally addressed to individuals. To take an obvious illustration. If I publish "a letter to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone on the currency" or "on the prospects of English coal,"—would you infer that I intend it for no other readers *except* Mr. Gladstone? Or rather, would not the fact of my *publishing* it be understood by all the world as indicating a precisely opposite intention? And where the convenience is so obvious of expressing propositions in this particular shape, why are we to take for granted that the Pontiff never adopts it?

Indeed, facts which are on the very surface of history, and the universal judgment of theologians on those facts, show how absolutely certain it is that we have rightly interpreted the language of these latter. In all the Church's history, there has never been a more momentous Papal utterance than S. Leo's condemnation of Eutyches. Yet it does not itself state that it was given as a definition at all, or intended for communication to others: it is in form merely a letter to S. Flavian; and indeed (as we have already shown) is mixed up with personal references and suggestions, in a far greater degree than would be the case with my supposed letter to Mr. Gladstone. On the other hand, that S. Leo fully intended to address the Universal Church through S. Flavian,—not only we do not deny, but it is the very fact on which we wish to insist. And now observe this: all theologians without exception, Ultramontane and Gallican alike, proclaim this letter to have been *ex cathedrâ*. Ultramontanes maintain that, as being *ex cathedrâ*, it is infallible; while Gallicans argue for their own views by alleging that, *although ex cathedrâ*, its doctrine was re-considered by the Council of Chalcedon. No one theologian, we believe, can be named, to whom the very supposition occurs, that there can be a doubt thrown on its *ex cathedrâ* character, by the fact of its being addressed formally to an individual bishop.

Theologians then unanimously accept a Letter, written by

S. Leo to S. Flavian, and abounding with personal appeals, as nevertheless a Rule of Faith for the Universal Church. What possible difficulty therefore, so far, could they have, in the supposition that Pius IX.'s two letters to the Archbishop of Cologne were issued with a similar intention? Indeed Pius IX.'s two Letters contain much fewer personal allusions and references than S. Leo's Epistle to S. Flavian. S. Leo condemned Eutyches *ex cathedrâ* by writing to the Patriarch of Constantinople; and Pius IX. condemned Günther *ex cathedrâ* by writing to the Archbishop of Cologne.

The following passage from Baronius seems as though it had been written on purpose to illustrate our whole argument. It will be found in A.D. 449, n. xxxix. :—

To these [legates] was given [in charge] the Epistle to Flavian; [which was not intended indeed] for him as an individual, *seeing that as a good Catholic he did not need it*; but in order that it might be read in full Synod as public and common to all. Nay this is further evident, that S. Leo desired not the Easterns only but all the Westerns also to be fortified by that Letter, as by an antidote ready prepared against the poison of this new heresy. Wherefore he willed that the Letter, which he had written to Flavian to be read in Synod, should be a *circular letter*; such as the Greeks call an *Encyclical*: in order that, by being made manifest to all throughout the Universal Church, handed from hand to hand, and copied out by all, *it might be equally known to every one*.

When we have given one further instance of a similar kind, we are sure that our readers will have been abundantly satisfied. No heresy ever arose more deadly than the Pelagian; nor are any ecclesiastical judgments therefore more vital than those which have condemned it. Now that distinguished theologian, F. Faure, S. J., has written on this subject; and his treatise is to be found in Zaccaria's "*Thesaurus*," vol. v., opusc. 5. He prefaces it by this remark :—"There are counted up four most noble monuments of sacred Antiquity, whereby the theologian may know what the Apostolic See prescribes to be held concerning the Grace of Christ, anterior to the very well-known decrees of the Council of Trent, and of later Pontiffs." He is now therefore going to mention all the important ante-Tridentine definitions, on this momentous doctrine. And which are they? Firstly, S. Celestine's Letter to the Bishops of Gaul; secondly, Pope Hormisdas's Letter to the African Bishop, Possessor; thirdly, the twenty-five canons of the second Provincial Council of Orange, which was attended by fourteen bishops; fourthly, Pope Boniface's letter of confirmation, addressed to the President of that Council. *Not one of the four definitions was addressed formally*

in any way to the Universal Church; and yet, amidst all the hot discussions on the general doctrine, no one theologian has ever been heard of, who on this ground doubted the infallible character of the decisions. Of course the canon of Orange would not have been infallible except for the Pontifical confirmation; but that is a different matter altogether. Our present illustration then may be taken as no less conclusive than the former, as to the real meaning of that theological dictum on which our objector relies.

It may also be worth mentioning that, concerning Hormisdas's letter to Possessor, Baronius states a fact very similar to what he had already mentioned concerning S. Leo's Dogmatic Letter:—viz., that "*it was made Encyclical, and dispersed far and wide through the provinces,*" A.D. 520, n. xxi.

A learned friend has forwarded us the following instances of Dogmatic Bulls addressed to one or more individuals. We merely state them for the examination of our theological readers. Pope Vigilius wrote a Dogmatic Letter to Eutychius, condemning Theodore of Mopsuestia. Pope Pelagius addressed a dogmatic definition on the Unity of Father and Son, to Vigilius, Bishop. Innocent IV. addressed a Dogmatic Bull, defining the immediate entrance of baptized infants into Heaven, "*ad Ottonem Cardinalem Tusculanum.*" Leo III. addressed a Dogmatic Letter on the Procession of the Holy Ghost, "*Omnibus Orientalibus Ecclesiis.*" Gregory XI. addressed his Dogmatic Bull condemning Wicklyffe to the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London. Eugenius IV. addressed a Dogmatic Bull against Philip Norris to the Archbishops of Dublin and Armagh. Paul II. sent a Dogmatic Letter to the Patriarch of the Maronites.

Our recent comment on the second Council of Orange reminds us of one final argument, with which we shall close this part of our subject. It is admitted, we believe, by all non-Gallican theologians without an exception, that the doctrinal decrees of a Provincial Synod are infallible if confirmed by the Pope. Theologians then account him as speaking *ex cathedrâ*, when he is formally addressing, not the Universal Church, but only a few bishops of one portion thereof. Benedict XIV., writing when Pope as a private theologian, is very clear on this head.

Since in these Provincial Councils which were assembled in the Church's earlier ages, recent heresies were sometimes condemned, and errors starting up through the province carefully repressed;—it thence arose that the Acts of such Councils were transmitted in a Synodal Epistle to the Roman Pontiff, in order that the approbation might be received of the first See and of

Christ's Vicar on earth, and so what had been determined in these particular assemblies of bishops might be received by all orthodox men as a dogma of Faith, and the Faith of all might be everywhere the same. . . . Melchior Canus, Bellarmine, Thomassinus teach rightly that a Provincial Council derives infallible authority from the Pontifical confirmation. For, argue Canus and Bellarmine, if this were not so, the errors of Helvidius, Pelagius, and Priscillian could not be said to have been proscribed by the Church's inefformable judgment . . . . It should be added that Augustine and Prosper considered that the condemnation of Pelagius was complete (*rem contra Pelagium omnino confectam*) as soon as the Synodal sentence of the African bishops was approved by the Apostolic See. *De Synodo Diocesana*, l. 13, c. 3, nn. 1, 2.

We have now stated and defended our various theses, and replied to objections adduced on the opposite side. At last, however, we by no means intend to assert that there is not occasionally some real or alleged Pontifical Act, concerning which there may be really a reasonable doubt whether it has or has not been put forth *ex cathedra*. But this is not at all peculiar to modern times. Consider, e.g., what was possibly one of the first definitions of faith ever put forth by a Pope; viz., S. Stephen's Decree on the re-baptizers. Some theologians deny its genuineness; others consider it disciplinary and not dogmatic; others, lastly, account it a real definition of faith. Again as regards the second Council of Orange, to which we have already referred, and of which the dogmatical decrees are among the most momentous ever put forth. Even in Suarez's days it was not absolutely certain that Pope Boniface at the time confirmed these decrees; but now there is no doubt whatever on the subject. As regards undoubted Pontifical utterances at all events, we see no kind of inconvenience in the uncertainty, whether some few are or are not *ex cathedra*. Even if not infallible, Pontifical Acts possess the highest authority short of infallibility; and, moreover, this uncertainty may be of valuable service in the way of moral probation. See our remarks in p. 97 of this article on a similar fact. Viewed as a theoretical objection, we can really see no force whatever in this circumstance. And as F. Ryder criticises with some severity a passage in which we have dwelt on this, we cannot do better than reprint it, and reply to his criticism.

Meanwhile an objection has been urged against our whole view, which some thinkers regard as very serious. They consider that "the gulf is infinite which separates what is of faith from what is not of faith," and allege very truly that our theory presents Catholic doctrine in a most different aspect. To us, their objection appears as unphilosophical as it is untheological. Is it the case in secular science that a line can be broadly and



sharply drawn, such that all on one side of that line is absolutely certain truth, while all on the other side is quite open and undetermined? Is not the opposite fact notorious? Some conclusions are absolutely established; others nearly so; others, again, under present circumstances, are much more probable than their contradictories, yet by no means sure not to be afterwards disproved; and so, along a kind of graduated scale, we finally arrive at those on which, as yet, one side is not more probable than the other. So in theology. One class of doctrines unquestionably demands the assent of divine faith. Of a second class, it is quite certain that they are infallibly true, and probable that they are an actual part of the deposit. A third class are beyond all doubt infallibly true, yet with no pretensions to be strictly of faith. Of a fourth class, it is more or less probable that they are infallibly true.\* A fifth class are almost certainly true, though not infallibly determined. And so by degrees we arrive at those on which every well-instructed Catholic has full liberty to take one side or the other. Thus, the pursuit of theological science becomes one sustained discipline of intellectual docility; thus the student is constantly reminded, that he thinks under the assiduous superintendence and direction of that Holy See, whose continuous infallibility is the abiding light of Catholic doctrine.

F. Ryder is unable to understand our distinction between the fourth and fifth of these classes; while on his own principles he denies that the second and third can possibly exist. We will give an instance therefore, in illustration of each class, to show that our classification is by no means (as F. Ryder thinks) "gratuitously minute." "One class of doctrines unquestionably demands the assent of divine faith:" viz. those of which the Church has declared that they were revealed to the Apostles. "Of a second class it is quite certain that they are infallibly true, and probable that they are an actual part of the Deposit. A third class are beyond all doubt infallibly true, yet with no pretensions to be strictly of faith." These two classes include all those truths, which the Church teaches infallibly, without condemning their contradictories as actually heretical. Some of these were very probably revealed to the Apostles, though the Church has not yet declared this: such are the contradictories to several of Quesnel's condemned propositions. Of others, on the contrary, it is quite certain that they were not revealed to the Apostles; as, e.g., the true objective sense of Jansenius's work. "Of a fourth class it is more or less probable that they are infallibly

---

\* F. Ryder (p. 27) has certainly contrived to make nonsense of this clause, by adding the words "though not infallibly determined;" which do not exist in our original. The mistake was evidently caused by their occurrence in the next line. But as his whole criticism was founded on the alleged unintelligibility of the passage, we think he should have taken particular pains to quote it correctly.



true." This class includes the cases already mentioned in this article: when it is not absolutely certain whether some Pontifical Act is *ex cathedrâ*; or again whether some proposition, contained in an *ex cathedrâ* Act, is an instruction or an *obiter dictum*; or lastly whether some doctrine be infallibly inculcated as *true*, or only as more probable. "A fifth class are almost [or quite] certainly true, though not infallibly determined:" as was the Immaculate Conception twenty years ago; as is now the doctrine of Papal infallibility.

We now come lastly to the testimony of theologians. And our attention in this respect is of course first due, to the citations accumulated in F. Ryder's pamphlet: see notes A. and C. These are adduced in favour of his thesis, that infallibility does not extend beyond the sphere of acts of divine faith; and consequently that the Church is not infallible in censures less severe, than those which he accounts equivalent to "heretical." Against this thesis we argued throughout the fourth article of our last number; while in our eighth article we contended, that not one of those theologians whom he adduces in its behalf really affords it any countenance whatever. We further pointed out that the Church's minor doctrinal judgments are often expressed in an affirmative shape; and we have now been maintaining that the doctrinal instruction of Encyclicals and of certain other Apostolic Letters are to be ranked in their number. Here then arises the first question to be considered under our present head. We are to ask whether F. Ryder's theological citations are of any value—not in favour of the thesis which we opposed in our last number, for that allegation we trust we there entirely disproved—but against the proposition for which we ourselves are arguing in this. We answer confidently in the negative. If our conclusion of October be once admitted—if it be once admitted that these theologians give no support to the thesis which we were then opposing—none of them throw a moment's difficulty in the way of our present proposition. Indeed there is but one which presents the most superficial appearance of such difficulty; viz., Gretser. His words, as quoted by F. Ryder in p. 34, may be understood to imply that the Pope never pronounces *ex cathedrâ* except by means of a Bull. But it is certain, *à priori*, that Gretser cannot possibly mean this; because notoriously the Pelagian, Nestorian, and Eutychian heresies were all condemned *ex cathedrâ*, and none of them by Bulls. And on looking at the passage itself, it is plain (as we pointed out in October, p. 490) that Gretser is giving *instances* of infallibility, and not *confining* infallibility to the instances which he gives.

So much then on F. Ryder's positive evidence. But on this matter of theological authority, there is a distinction between the proposition which we discussed in October and that which is now before us. F. Ryder fully admitted that there is a large number of theologians, who defend the Church's infallibility in her minor censures; he only contended that others advocate a different view, and that the question is open. Our contest then with him terminated, so soon as we showed that the theologians whom he adduced as holding this latter view did not really hold it at all. It would have been irrelevant and unmeaning, had we taken the trouble to adduce a catena of theologians in favour of our own thesis; because such a catena would only have established a fact, which our opponent expressly admitted. But here the case is different. F. Ryder considers that our present position is our own "peculiar increment" to what he admits to be otherwise a "received opinion." Here therefore it will be desirable to adduce positive testimonies in our own behalf. At the same time let it be distinctly understood that we are not adducing the language of theologians as any positive corroboration of our own proposition; for which we have already assigned, we think, most conclusive reasons. Here we shall merely maintain that there is nothing in the silence, and still less in the language, of theologians, which tends ever so remotely to invalidate the arguments which we have already adduced. We confine our argument strictly within these limits, because (as we shall presently explain) we find ourselves quite unable to apprehend what it is which F. Ryder regards as our "peculiar increment" to an otherwise "received opinion." We cannot possibly enter on a detailed discussion of theological authority, until we distinctly understand what is the question which that authority is called in to decide; and our present remarks will therefore be but fragmentary and brief.

Firstly, then, we would revert to the circumstance above mentioned. F. Ryder, in his letter to the *Tablet* of last October, says that his *main* controversy with us turns on the question of Encyclicals and other Apostolic Letters. Yet he has not been able to adduce one single writer, who draws a distinction between dogmatic Bulls or accurately expressed censures on one hand, and the instruction of Encyclicals or other Apostolic Letters on the other hand. This fact is to be carefully observed. Ultramontane writers enlarge again and again on the infallibility of a Papal utterance *ex cathedra*—not, indeed, as regards its preamble arguments and obiter dicta—but as regards its direct instruction. They speak indeed occasionally as though no utterance were

ex cathedrâ except a definition of faith, strictly so called; and we considered this language of theirs in October, pp. 492-497. Again they speak at other times, as though no utterance were infallible which is not formally addressed to the Universal Church; and we have considered this language in our present article. But as to any distinction between Bulls on the one hand and Apostolic Letters on the other—or any distinction between precisely expressed censures on the one hand and the *instruction* of an Apostolic Letter on the other—not one word of this kind has F. Ryder been able to discover. The Syllabus in particular drew special attention—and was doubtless so intended by Pius IX.—to the authority of Encyclicals, Allocutions, and other Apostolic Letters; yet—putting aside F. Ryder himself—no one theologian, reputed orthodox, has come forward to deny the infallibility of the instructions which are contained in those Letters.

But, now (2), several very distinguished theologians have, even in the brief period since its appearance, expressly taught the infallibility of the Syllabus. We have already mentioned in this connection the Archbishop of Westminster; Dr. Murray; F. Schröder, S.J.; F. Reiss, S.J.; the Civiltà Jesuits. To these we now add F. Gury, S.J.; who, in the last edition of his "Moral Theology" published at Lyons and Paris, includes among condemned propositions those of the Syllabus: "in which," he says, "Peter truly *spoke through Pius*" (vol. ii., p. 627); the well-known ecclesiastical phrase for "*Pius spoke ex cathedrâ*." F. Perrone ("Omaggio Cattolico," p. 17) calls both the "*Quantâ curâ*" and the Syllabus "*the teaching of Peter*," "the words of Peter *speaking in his successors*." "The propagators of impious and subversive doctrines," he says, "may give to these words treacherous and fraudulent interpretations, . . . but *the teaching of Peter* will make the circuit of the earth, and *everywhere obtain dominion*." We believe moreover that F. Gallerani, S.J., in a sermon preached at Rome, taught the infallibility of the Syllabus, and the obligation of assenting to its doctrine; and was honoured by the Holy Father's command to publish his sermon.

(3) In regard to those Apostolic Letters of modern times, concerning which F. Ryder has raised the controversy, almost the only matters directly theological to which they refer are those which concern the Sacrament of Matrimony. If then you would know the habitual mind of theologians concerning their authority, it is to the discussions on Matrimony that you should chiefly look.

We will begin with F. Perrone's work on the subject. In vol. i., p. 157, he cites Pius IX.'s condemnation of Nuytz, and thus comments thereon:—"Since these articles were proscribed as false and erroneous, it follows that *according to Catholic doctrine*" their contradictories are true. He accounted then their condemnation to have been *ex cathedrâ*. Then he immediately proceeds (p. 158) to say: "the Roman Pontiff has *still more explicitly manifested the same truth* (*idem enucleatius adhuc patefecit*) *in his Letter to the King of Sardinia.*" He ascribes then to this Letter also a similar authority. In a later portion of the same volume (p. 409) occurs the following passage:—

A man cannot be called a heretic or schismatic who holds [this] doctrine . . . because no express and formal definition of the Church has been pronounced concerning it. But the absence of this definition does not hinder the doctrine from being justly called false, erroneous, *contrary to the Church's doctrine and practice.* . . . Besides the notes of heresy and schism *there are many other censures with which doctrines are branded.* . . . Nor is the declaration of an Ecumenical Council necessarily required for this; since the Church is *not less infallible* when dispersed than when assembled in Council. The Roman Pontiff, her head, has openly sent forth her true doctrine on this matter in almost innumerable Acts, as is evident from the doctrines above adduced.

And a few pages earlier he had said that the doctrine which contradicts this error "is not indeed *de fide*; is not a *dogma*;" because "as yet there is no direct and express solemn definition of the Church:" but that it is "*true, Catholic, and certain doctrine*" (p. 401).

We next pass to the authority of F. Gury, supported by F. Ballerini, S.J., Professor of Moral Theology at the Roman College. In F. Ballerini's edition of Gury (vol. ii., pp. 695, 6), appears a list of "*errors condemned by Pius IX. concerning Matrimony and its impediments.*" This list is taken from two Pontifical Acts: viz., the condemnation of Nuytz and the Allocution concerning New Grenada. Moreover, this edition appeared after the publication of the Syllabus which recites all these errors: and yet Gury quotes—not the Syllabus—but the original Acts; as though considering *them* of even more primary and direct authority than the Syllabus itself. From these Acts, he had said before (p. 671), "*it is certain* (*constat*) that Matrimony can never exist among the faithful without the Sacrament." No theologian would so speak unless he considered these Acts to be *ex cathedrâ*; and F. Ballerini, by adding no comment, implies

agreement with this doctrine. Let us now go back to a somewhat earlier period. F. Martin, S.J., wrote a work mentioned with the warmest praise by F. Perrone (*"De Matrimonio Christiano,"* vol. ii., p. 435, note 38) against a view then held by Carrière, that the civil power can constitute diriment impediments. In this work F. Martin thus speaks concerning Pius VIII.'s Encyclical, *"Traditi humilitati."* It will be observed that he speaks of his doctrine concerning Encyclicals as *certain*.

"Here the Holy Pontiff *certainly* speaks as the *Supreme Teacher of the whole Church*; as Universal Pastor of sheep and lambs, i.e., of bishops and faithful; as Magister of the Faith; in one word, *ex cathedrâ*. Therefore, what he here teaches concerning Matrimony . . . *appertains to Catholic doctrine and the dogmata of Faith*" (vol. ii., p. 600).

Earlier in the same volume (p. 539) he accounts as *ex cathedrâ* a letter of Pius VI. to the Bishop of Motola, concerning which we spoke some pages back (p. 104, note) in reference to F. Perrone.\* Moreover—which is very remarkable—Carrière himself had not ventured to deny this (see his words, quoted textually by F. Martin, pp. 530–532); but only maintained that the declaration on which F. Martin relied was an *obiter dictum*. Indeed the great Sulpician, throughout his work, consistently accepts the instruction of Pontifical Letters as conclusive on all points of doctrine; though he has not (so far as we have observed) applied himself expressly to the question, *which* are to be accounted strictly *ex cathedrâ*. In the preface to the last edition of his *"Compendium,"* he uses these words:—"We have applied ourselves," he says, "to this task . . . that we should deduce our solution of these controversies especially from the *Decrees of Councils and the Apostolic Letters of the Supreme Pontiffs.*" There are various Apostolic Letters, then—though he does not specify which,—placed by him on an equal grade of authority with the decrees of Councils.†

(4.) At last however the great majority of truths, taught in later Pontifical Acts, relate to things philosophical and to things politico-religious. Our next inquiry therefore will be, how

---

\* "*Et quamvis intenderit S. Pontifex ut hæc declaratio esset omnibus norma credendi, et agendi, &c., &c.*"

† F. Martin has some admirable remarks, to which we shall refer in a future number, on a cognate subject; on the inestimable value even of those Pontifical declarations which are not in themselves infallible, as *testimonies* of that *permanent Roman tradition* which does enjoy that prerogative. Carrière

their decision of *these* questions is accepted by loyal Catholics. On things philosophical we are unexpectedly relieved from all necessity of search for authorities, by a singular testimony issuing from one of F. Ryder's staunchest supporters. In our "notices" we reply to a letter which appeared in the *Tablet* of Oct. 10 from a writer signing himself "a Roman Doctor of Divinity": here we only refer to it in its bearing on our present subject. We said in October that this writer "apparently disbelieves the infallibility of those censures" which condemned Hermes and Günther. To think this, he replies, is to "suspect" his "orthodoxy." The very supposition that he can possibly have intended to deny this infallibility, he accounts an "extreme" worthy only of one "who never knew the middle of humanity, but only the extremity of both ends." Our readers need hardly be reminded that Hermes was condemned by a Brief, not a Bull, of Gregory XVI.; and Günther by an Apostolic Letter of Pius IX., addressed formally to the Archbishop of Cologne. To doubt the infallibility of such documents then, is an offence (it seems) of which no "Roman Doctor of Divinity" can even be suspected by any one who possesses a well-balanced and temperate judgment.

The "Roman Doctor" has good grounds for his confidence on this head. We have already spoken more than once on Günther: let us now say a few words on Hermes. In one of our "notices" we treat F. Perrone's Essay on Hermesianism. In that notice it will be seen (1) that Hermes's errors were philosophical in their foundation; (2) that Gregory XVI. claimed infallibility in their condemnation; and (3) that F. Perrone heartily supports that claim. In another of our notices, our readers will see the history of the Pontiff's recent condemnation of certain philosophical errors advocated by Prof. Ubaghs; and the universal acceptance of that condemnation.

It is really not necessary to say more on this particular head. But it will further interest and edify our readers, if we translate a retraction which Mgr. Hugonin was required to make before being consecrated Bishop of Bayeux. We find the original in the "*Civiltà*" of Sept. 7, 1867, p. 581:—

Whereas I the undersigned have understood from the Most Eminent Archbishop of Myra, Apostolic Nuncio in France, that the doctrine, which

---

uses language strikingly similar, in that Preface from which we quote in the text. We shall adduce them hereafter against the opinion—incidentally expressed by F. Ryder (p. 31)—that "the Pope is not" "our infallible guide *vivà voce et praxi*."



I laid down concerning *ontologism* in my philosophical work, *is disapproved by the Apostolic See* as favouring explicitly or implicitly those propositions of which the *Congregation of the Inquisition* decreed in the year 1861 that they could not be taught with safety—without delay I freely and spontaneously declare that I account and disapprove the aforesaid doctrine as more or less aberrant from sound principles of philosophy in precisely the same way in which the *Holy See* has so judged: and at the same time I promise that in future, so far as in me lies, I will take care that it be not taught any longer in schools.—Paris, Oct. 13, 1866.—H. Hugonin, Priest.

For want of a better arrangement, we may class among “things philosophical” the question whether youths may without danger acquire “elegance and eloquence” of language from the heathen classics. The Holy Office, as we quoted in our last number (pp. 533, 4), declares that the affirmative doctrine is quite certain; and quotes, as if alone a sufficient proof, Pius IX.’s partial Encyclical to the French bishops.

(5.) Lastly, concerning things politico-religious. As to the Holy Father’s civil sovereignty, see what authority the University of Cagliari ascribes as a matter of course to Allocutions and Encyclicals:—

The Sovereign Pontiff has more than once expressly declared that in the present condition of society the temporal power of the Holy See is both most useful and even necessary . . . This Pontifical declaration has been accepted with unparalleled unanimity by the whole Catholic Episcopate *from which the spirit of truth never departs.\**

Then we observed in October (p. 335), that in France, “whichever side is taken by a good Catholic on these subjects—be he Parisis, Morel, or Godard—he always accepts it as a first principle that the ‘*Mirari vos*’ and other similar utterances represent the Church’s infallible voice.” In that number we gave instances of a similar fact, in Germany, from the late work of Mgr. Ketteler. Let us now advert to the three above-named French writers. From Morel it would be preposterous to accumulate instances; for he belongs to that school which its opponents reproach as “extreme,” and which is represented by the *Univers*. But M. Godard—who differs from M. Morel on such topics as widely as one good Catholic can differ from another—is equally explicit on the authority of Encyclicals. Thus, when about to cite Gregory XVI.’s severe language concerning liberty of conscience, he prefaces

---

\* Quoted by F. Herbert Vaughan in his pamphlet on the French Episcopate. Preface, p. vii.



his citation by this remark: "See how that authority pronounces *which directs the conscience and the faith of Catholics.*" Here follows the well-known paragraph from the "*Mirari vos*;" and M. Godard thus continues: "In these words, *or rather in this oracle*, there is a condemnation, &c., &c.,"\* Mgr. de Paris occupies, it may be said, a kind of middle position in ecclesiastical politics between M. Morel and M. Godard. Here are specimens of his language:—

A Catholic Christian cannot account the civil liberty of worships a good in itself, without contradicting *the formal and obligatory instruction of the Holy See.*

When the Church tolerates or even approves . . . constitutions which consecrate liberty of worships, the reason is that she considers there have been state reasons sufficient to render them legitimate: but none the less she preserves *her doctrine* intact.

So far from the doctrine [condemned in the "*Mirari vos*" on liberty of the press] being ours, we condemn and reprobate it, *as the Holy See condemns and reprobates it.*†

Entirely similar to this was the great Dominican's language on the "*Mirari vos*" at its first appearance. "I do rejoice," he said, "that the Sovereign Pontiff . . . has *by his sacred authority decided the questions* which were tearing to pieces the Church of France, and turning out of the right path a crowd of souls deceived in all sincerity, and by whose dangerous fascinations *I had myself been captivated.*" Again, writing to M. de Montalembert: "*The Church says 'believe' . . . bow down your reason before that of God and before the Church which is His mouthpiece.* Why has the Church been given to us unless it be to bring us back to the Truth when we have fallen into error? . . . You are astonished at what the Holy See requires from M. de la Mennais, &c., &c."‡

These various citations are surely altogether sufficient for the purpose for which we have adduced them; they are altogether sufficient to show, that there is nothing in the language or the silence of theologians, which tends in any way to invalidate the proofs we have drawn out of our respective theses. As we have already observed (p. 117), we cannot go further into the matter—we cannot enter on a direct discussion of theological authority—until we distinctly understand what that authority is called on to decide. F. Ryder's "*Idealism*" throws no light whatever on this question. Nothing indeed can be more intelligible than his own theory; viz., that the

\* "Les Principes de '89." Edition corrigée, pp. 134, 136.

† Cas de Conscience. Deuxième édition, pp. 15, 29, 75.

‡ Chocarné's Life of Lacordaire, English translation, pp. 114, 117.

Church is infallible in no judgments, except those which expressly or equivalently condemn the contradictory tenet as heretical. Let us call this theory A. We argued against it in two articles of our last number, and contended that no approved theologian ever dreamed of maintaining it. But F. Ryder admits that there is a different theory altogether, which has been held by considerable theologians, and which Dr. Ward (he thinks) has perniciously exaggerated. Let us call this theory B.; the theory, namely, that the Church is infallible in all her minor censures. F. Ryder considers that Dr. Ward has added a "peculiar increment" to theory B; and that this increment is "new, unauthorised, and productive of much mischief." Our business would then be to show that Dr. Ward's "increment" is *not* unauthorised and mischievous; but that we cannot for the life of us discover from F. Ryder's pages what that increment is. Our opponent's words indeed seem to give an answer; but we cannot persuade ourselves that it is what he intends. However we will place before our readers those passages which seem calculated to throw light on F. Ryder's meaning; and we will italicise those sentences which strike us as especially relevant. It will be observed with much pleasure, how consistently respectful is F. Ryder in speaking of those Pontifical Acts, to which, unhappily, he will not ascribe infallibility.

I am not denying that there are sometimes real definitions of faith in encyclicals; but these are infallible, and demand our interior assent, not simply in virtue of their being in encyclicals, but because they *are* definitions of faith. Of course I allow that all encyclicals and official letters of the Pope, since they go so far to engage the Church to the particular line they take, must be in a special manner under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who is pledged to preserve the Church from all errors of faith and morals, and all such errors of discipline as would militate against her life. The mere fact that the Holy Father is speaking, is sufficient to secure, from all good Catholics, respect and obedience. We cannot doubt but that the general course of his instructions is holy and true, in a sense that no other instruction is; nay it is probable that sometimes he is speaking under the influence of the Spirit of Truth himself; but all this is widely different from saying that, *where the Pope has not selected any particular proposition for his formal sanction or censure*, our absolute interior assent is definitely demanded to what *may appear to us the main propositions* of a Pontifical document.

I presume Dr. Ward's distinction between the "doctrinal instructions" and the "obiter dicta" must turn entirely on the Pope's intention, which *the case supposes not to have been formally expressed*; it must be gathered then from the nature of the controversy, or the state of parties which has elicited the document in question.

Where, then, it is a question of parties whose principles have not yet been worked out, in fact *where no particular point of doctrine has been submitted to the Holy See for decision*, it would, à fortiori, be rash and mischievous to claim interior assent for approvals and condemnations, *the theological value of which has not been authoritatively determined*.

The theological value of such ecclesiastical utterances should be tested by the use theologians make of them. I know that they accept the *formal condemnations as false, of propositions*, when reduced to its strictest, narrowest sense, as of irrefragable authority; but I have never found in the treatises of classical theologians any attempt to ground a certain argument upon the "doctrinal instructions" of encyclicals as such, i. e. upon propositions *they have themselves selected* from the letters of Popes.—(Pp. 15, 17, 26.)

It would seem from these extracts, that the contrast intended by our opponent is not between Dogmatic Bulls on one hand and less solemn utterances on the other, but turns on a different consideration altogether. His words import, that all theologians hitherto have confined infallibility to "*particular propositions*" which "*the Pope has himself selected* for his formal sanction or censure;" and that Dr. Ward has introduced a gratuitous and mischievous innovation, in alleging that Catholics are sometimes called on to distinguish *for themselves* between the direct instruction of a Pontifical Act and its obiter dicta. Yet it is quite impossible that such can really be our opponent's meaning. So far are theologians from confining infallibility to "*propositions selected by the Pope himself for sanction or censure*," that the contradictory of this statement is quite a common place in theology. It is quite a common place in theology that Catholics are to examine *for themselves*, in the case of a Pontifical judgment, which part is to be understood as infallible instruction, and which is to be understood as containing arguments and obiter dicta. Take the very passage of F. Tanner which F. Ryder quotes:—

If the Pontiff puts forth *any decree* in the materia of Faith as Pastor of the Church, *we must diligently examine*, from the circumstances, the words of the decree, the occasion of writing, the question proposed, &c., *what it is* which the Pontiff intends *directly to determine*. For those things which are said *only by way of proving and confirming* that [which is directly determined], or otherwise are only said obiter and incidentally, do not fall under the definition; nor is the Pope *supposed* (censetur) to intend obliging the Church to their belief. . . . [Nor does he speak infallibly] as often as it may be inferred *from words and circumstances* that he is only expressing his private judgment or proposing something merely as the more probable doctrine. In estimating which matter, *both the judgment of the learned and the sense and consent of the faithful count for a great deal*.

Tanner speaks here with a certain exaggeration, as though in *every* Pontifical judgment Catholics were required carefully to make such a distinction; but this fact only evinces more strongly how *frequently* these cases occur. It is quite impossible then to suppose that F. Ryder, who himself quotes this passage of Tanner's, can really intend to say what his words more obviously purport.

Nor indeed could any Catholic on reflection maintain such an opinion as F. Ryder's words convey in their more obvious sense. As we have so often pointed out, Gregory XVI. in a later Encyclical declares that in the "*Mirari vos*" he "defined" "Catholic doctrine" on those questions which had been referred to him concerning Lamennais: yet the "*Mirari vos*" contains no definition whatever on those matters, expressed with *precise logical accuracy*. Again, the various errors denounced in the Syllabus had all been infallibly condemned in earlier Acts (see p. 101 of this article); but many of them had not in those earlier Acts been explicitly "selected" for "censure."

Here then is our difficulty. On what ground is a difference to be made between ancient and modern Letters Apostolic? Why is it to be held that S. Celestine's Encyclical to the Bishops of Gaul was infallible, but that that prerogative is not enjoyed by Gregory XVI.'s Encyclical to all the bishops of the Church? Why is it to be held that S. Leo's Dogmatic Letter to S. Flavian was *ex cathedra*, but that Pius IX.'s Doctrinal Letters to the Archbishop of Cologne occupy a lower position? F. Ryder's own answer is most intelligible; viz., that the Church's infallibility is confined to what he accounts definitions of faith. To this we replied at length in our last number. But he further says that even those theologians, who admit the Church's infallibility in all her minor censures,\* would yet deny the infallibility of Apostolic Letters; and here it is that we fail to catch his meaning. We cannot then argue more directly and formally than we have done on the theological authority adducible for his thesis, until we are able to form at least some guess as to what his thesis is. We sincerely hope that his forthcoming pamphlet will make it clear.

We began this article with criticizing two objections, which have been urged against our raising this question; and we

---

\* We are expressing ourselves, of course, from F. Ryder's point of view. We are most confident that *all* approved theologians really teach this.

will conclude it by noting two objections which have been urged, against the answer we give to it now we *have* raised it.

Firstly, then, it is said, that this theory adds increased point to the historical objections adduced against Catholicism. But we maintain that the Church herself teaches this doctrine; and it is very certain that what the Church teaches cannot be refuted by history. Indeed so much as this may be said at once. Protestants have been vigorous "devil's advocates" against the Pope; and they have accumulated from every corner of ecclesiastical history every objection to his teaching on which they could lay hand. See, e. g., the list of Protestant objections to which Bellarmine replies in his work "*de Summo Pontifice*," l. 4, c. 8—14. Now certainly the allegation, against S. Liberius and against Honorius, of having sanctioned actual heresy, is far more historically plausible than any which would bear on our present question; than any which we have seen adduced against any other Pope, of having taught erroneously in any Apostolic Letter which we should account *ex cathedrâ*.

The second objection appears on the surface much more weighty. "If the minimistic error," it is said, "be so opposed "to the Church's teaching, how can you account for the fact "that she has not expressly and in terms, before this, condemned it?"

Now a distinction must be carefully drawn between two different forms of minimistic error. Those who embrace that error in its extreme shape, restrict the Church's infallibility to her definitions of faith: they admit distinctly that she has put forth various minor censures; and they hold that in all or in many of these censures she is fallible. Some such notion exists in a vague and general way among a multitude of men, who do not like to abandon the profession of Catholicism, while, in fact, they are absolutely indifferent to the claims of religion. Moreover this extreme error is held, we believe, in England by various unsound and disloyal Catholics—reliquiæ of the *Home and Foreign Review*, and others,—who are very far from deficient in zeal for the Church's interest as *they* understand it. But we know of no ground whatever for thinking—and we do not in the least think—that this opinion has ever been formally brought before the notice of supreme ecclesiastical authority, and passed without censure. Nor in its explicit shape does it possess so much vogue or currency among the Catholics of any country, that any inference whatever can legitimately be drawn, from the Church having hitherto kept silence. F. Ryder indeed, in his "*Idealism*," has put forth various expressions, which we do not see how

it is possible to understand otherwise; but then that pamphlet only appeared in May, and he is already preparing explanations. We write before we have seen his second pamphlet: but he has declared in a letter to the *Tablet* that we have essentially misunderstood his meaning; and that he holds it unsound, nay actually heretical, to doubt the infallibility of the "Unigenitus" with all its censures. And we most cheerfully testify, that the general tone and spirit of his first pamphlet are very far indeed from congenial with that deplorable error, which we understood him to express therein.

But by far the more common shape assumed by minimism is a greatly mitigated one. There is a number of Catholics—absolutely perhaps not inconsiderable, though consisting (we believe) chiefly of laymen—who would be shocked at the very thought of the Church being fallible in any teaching which she may put forth, but who have persuaded themselves that she does not *intend* to teach in Encyclicals or other Apostolic Letters. Thus in France many a man calls himself a "liberal Catholic," and holds a very singular position in regard to the "*Mirari vos*," the "*Quantâ curâ*," and other similar pronouncements. He will not expressly state that these Encyclicals are wrong in doctrine; perhaps he will not permit himself consciously to think that they are so: yet he is very far from putting forth any consistent effort, to bring his opinions into accordance with their unmistakable teaching. In Germany the questions which excite interest are philosophical rather than political; but the German "liberal Catholic" in his theological aspect resembles the French. He will not say in so many words—perhaps he will not consciously think—that the Pope's philosophical decisions are narrow-minded and pernicious: but he *will* continue to entertain opinions, which the Holy Father has in fact condemned; he will indulge in that contempt for scholastic theology, which so many Pontiffs have reproved; he will be very widely removed from that interior submission to the doctrinal decrees of Roman Congregations, which the Munich Brief so emphatically enjoins.

Now no one has ever dreamed that these "liberal Catholics" profess any tenet which excludes them from the Visible Church. Doubtless we maintain confidently that their tenets have been infallibly condemned; still they have not been condemned as heretical, but as meriting some milder censure. And the objection before us, therefore, comes merely to this: "The existence of such men in considerable numbers is notorious; and if the Church regarded their views as "unsound and censurable—as directly opposed to her infal-



"liberal teaching—for protection of that doctrine and in maternal charity she would admonish and reprove them."

In answering this objection, we will fix our attention on the French "liberal Catholics;" because whatever is said of them may easily be applied to those of kindred spirit in Germany. The French "liberal Catholics," as a rule, are most pious and exemplary men; enthusiastic defenders of the Pope and his civil principedom; and men who have in time past done invaluable service to the Church. On the other hand, they cling to their prejudice concerning the "modern liberties" with a certain strange fanaticism, and allow that prejudice to colour their whole view of facts both past and present. Possibly enough God, Who Alone reads the heart, may see in some of these men that a greater or less degree of venial sin and imperfection has been the cause of their not rightly discerning the Church's guidance or not truly interpreting her voice. But as to their ignorance being *gravely* culpable, we may consider this presumably incredible in men who so zealously and piously frequent the sacraments.

How does the Church act towards them? Firstly, she repeats her doctrine on the subject again and again; hardly a year passes without some fresh condemnation of "liberalismus hodiernus." She takes for granted the truth of that doctrine in all her official acts; and bases on it the whole civil constitution of the Roman States. She earnestly encourages Catholics to write in its defence. Witness the Holy Father's recent eulogium on the *Civiltà*; witness also the letter of thanks written by his command to M. de Beaulieu, for that nobleman's admirable reply to the deplorable oration delivered by M. de Montalembert at the Malines Congress of 1863.\* All that can be said on the other side is, that she does not take any step which would compel them peremptorily and at once to choose, between expressly rebelling against the Church on the one hand, or abandoning some of their most cherished and pervasive views on the other. These views, we again repeat, being regarded by no one as actually heretical.

The question then to be considered is this. Does such forbearance as we describe imply any disparagement whatever of the doctrine taught in the "Mirari vos," and in numberless other Apostolic Letters? Does it afford any ground whatever for doubting that the Church accounts that doctrine infallibly true, and as in real truth obligatory on the con-

---

\* This very important letter will be found in our number for April, 1865, pp. 479, 480.



science? To ask such a question is surely to answer it. The "Liberal Catholic" has made his false tenet the centre, round which he has gathered a multitude of settled, habitual, and powerful convictions. Let him be required in a moment to surrender these convictions on pain of breaking with the Church, he is plunged for certain in the extreme of bewilderment and perplexity, and exposed to real danger of apostacy. It is immeasurably a more healthy and a more hopeful process, that the truth be brought before him—not peremptorily by the Church's abrupt action,—but gradually by means of argument and persuasion. Thus, as he comes by degrees to understand more clearly both the infallible truth of her doctrine, its obligation, and its real purport, so by proportionate degrees he learns its reasonableness, its consistency with facts, its value in behalf of true liberty, its adaptation to man's highest interests. That the Church prefers such methods as these to others of a more stringent character, is surely no presumption that she regards liberalism as in any way reconcilable with her teaching: it only shows that she chooses these means rather than those, for the promotion and enforcement of that doctrine which she has infallibly declared.

We hope, accordingly, that our own method of procedure is that most in harmony with her wishes and counsels. Our desire throughout this discussion has been, to cast no shadow of suspicion on the thorough good faith of those with whom we are at issue; to put aside all notion of achieving any sudden or startling result; to aim exclusively at promoting, as best we may be able, the gradual but sure growth of individual conviction.

---

## ART. V.—POPULAR EDUCATION IN ENGLAND.

*Children's Employment Commission. Six Reports of the Commissioners, with Appendices. 6 vols. (1862-7.)* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. London.

*Report of the Commissioners appointed to Inquire into the State of Popular Education in England. Vol. I.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. London. 1861.

*Speech on the Second Reading of the Education of the Poor Bill, July 10, 1867, by the Right Hon. H. A. BRUCE, M.P.* London: William Ridgway, 169, Piccadilly.

FOR twenty years the political question of the day has been Electoral Reform. The last session of the present Parliament has in some sense solved that question; and it is now, for a time at least, at rest. But close upon the heels of Reform has naturally enough come the question of Popular Education. Popular education is now claimed as the watchword of the Liberal and Radical party.

It is the genius of our political organization that one at least of the existing parties in the State should adopt a watchword or cry, by means of which, like a huntsman, it rallies to itself its largest field. Nor can this watchword or party cry be chosen fortuitously, like the pass-word to the barracks or to a military picket. It must involve some object dear to a large section, at least, of the population; it must be a question taken out of the heart of the people; it must be the one petition which they have to present; the one boon they can be brought to insist on having; the one remedy which is to cure some crying evil, or to confer some undoubted benefit. It need not, indeed, be a point which is in actual agitation, but it must be something sufficiently real, practical, and inherent, though perhaps dormant, in the breast and life of the people, as that, after a season of political agitation, it may awaken and rouse the whole nation to an assertion of its will; as when the Repeal of the Corn Laws and Free Trade were carried, and, recently, the Rating Franchise. Hungry politicians and statesmen greedy of power view a population much as generals reconnoitre a people and country which they wish to turn to their own account. They examine and feel what are the questions which will mature first, what is the boon which the people can be most readily brought to clamour for. And, having

thus made of a popular topic a convenient stalking-horse, they proceed calmly and scientifically to lead it forth.

But there are other statesmen whose conduct is based on conscientious motives of duty, whose policy is governed, not by party interest, personal ambition, and love of power, but by a high sense of duty towards God and towards the people for whom they live. The real key to their policy is the glory of God and the good of their fellow-men. Such men still exist among us; and we may be permitted to quote with admiration the words, which lie before us as we write, of an eminent leader in the present House of Commons. He says, "We are under the clear and simple obligation of doing what we can to point out the right line of public policy, let those pursue it who will. In difficult cases let us only strive to estimate calmly the bearings of duty, and act accordingly. The issue must be left in Higher hands." These are words of a Christian statesman.

Now, upon whichever of these two classes of statesmen we fix our attention, we shall find that they concur in considering education to be the question of the day. Or if, instead of dividing statesmen into the categories of the selfish and of the conscientious, we divide them into the political classes of Liberal and Conservative, we shall still find that both insist on Popular Education. Two topics principally have agitated the kingdom during the last thirty years: Free Trade and Reform. They were both successively the war-cry of the Liberal and Radical schools; and they were both finally solved and put to rest by the measures of the opposite school. But now the hostile parties edifyingly confess together that education is the problem of the most pressing necessity for the welfare of the people and of the State.

The Conservatives having passed their Reform Bill, began busily to address their constituents during the recess upon the subject of popular education. It was said with a pleasant irony that the masses were called in to form a Government, and that therefore they require education;—an education, of course, comprising the Conservative element of the Christian religion. But no sooner had the Conservatives spoken, than the Liberals and Radicals clamoured louder than ever for popular education. "Yes," said they, "let there be education; but a real sterling education, divested of all sectarian and Conservative principles—an education thoroughly Liberal, thoroughly Radical: *we* are the friends of education." Not to refer to the hundred speeches which have been addressed to the country by the Liberal and Radical schools, it will be sufficient to indicate the rapid action taken by

Lord Russell, who affects to be the guide or "ganger" of his large and powerful party.

As soon as Parliament had re-assembled in extraordinary autumnal session to vote supplies for the Abyssinian expedition, Earl Russell hastened to make a move for his party, and brought forward an educational programme conceived under four Resolutions. These resolutions were sufficiently vague and general, but withal of so Radical a sense as to be capable of drawing within their meshes the most numerous and most extreme of the Liberal and Radical elements. But the Whig chieftain stood on the heath alone. Of all the Peers he had himself created during a career of power of thirty years, not one was there to second him. Though he had given timely notice of his measure, he spoke to empty benches, and received an answer and correction from the Duke of Marlborough. It was the saddest humiliation he had ever fallen upon as Earl Russell. Could it be that a Nemesis had for seventeen years tracked the footsteps of the Durham letter?

But to pass on. It does not require an eagle's eye to discern the general track and direction taken in politics by the people of England. In 1829 they planted the basis of religious toleration and equality; in 1848 they consecrated the principle of Free Trade and got cheap bread; in 1867 they secured to themselves in the mass the representation and government of the country. And now all parties are agreed upon the necessity of an extensive system of education; and the battle to be fought is, *what* shall that system be? There are three issues, or more properly only two, for the third is a compromise, and lets in the main principle in dispute. In the course of a few years the nation will have finally committed itself to a path along which there will be no returning. The crucial and vital importance of the choice of the path, whichever it may be; of the lot which must await the people along its way; of the bourne to which it infallibly leads, no words can say, no mind can adequately understand.

Which are the two distinct systems of education and the compromise, for which men are beginning to contend? One party urges that education shall be purely secular, that is, without the admixture of religious and doctrinal teaching. Their actual example of such a system is the United States' National Common School. The other party maintains that education shall continue to be religious and denominational, according to the principles adopted by the Committee of Council in the year 1839. But between these two parties,

which are perfectly distinct and consistent, there comes in a third. It is a kind of *mezzo termine*, one of those numerous compromises so dear to practical, illogical Englishmen when in perplexity. It is the "conscience-clause" and the "rating-clause" party. The "conscience-clause" was invented by Lord Granville, and its effect is to remove the authority whereby a clergyman can require the ordinary course of religious instruction to be given to the whole of his school, and to vest an absolute right in parents or guardians to send their children indeed to the school, but to forbid their receiving any religious instruction whatever, or frequenting any church or chapel. Under this system the children of professed secularists might claim exemption from learning even the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, or the History of the Bible or the Life of Christ. It would be impossible to teach the whole school that Christ was *God-man* on account of the Unitarians; or the eternity of punishment, or the efficacy of grace and the sacraments, on account of the objections that would be raised by parents or guardians of different denominations. In fact, the daily and hourly religious culture, so important in a Poor School, would become impossible; and it would be necessary to separate religion from the daily work of a child, and to confine it to the Church, which would be like taking all the salt that should be mingled with our daily food, and eating it alone before breakfast. It would relegate religious instruction from the school-room to the Church.

Moreover, there is even a financial injustice in the "conscience clause;" for it enacts that, though the school may have been built almost entirely by subscriptions for the instruction of children in the religious faith of the contributors, yet that if the State have contributed however small a proportion towards the erection of the school, a perpetual obligation may be enforced to separate the religious from the secular instruction and lessons of the day. It imposes a legal obligation wholly to ignore the truths of revelation in the presence, it may be of a considerable number, of the children who may be sent to the school.

We shall have to consider more in detail the character and working of the "conscience clause" in a future article. We have gone into it thus far *in limine* in order to justify our assertion that it is a compromise, which introduces the radical principle of the Secularist school.

We may here briefly state, for the sake of clearness, what are broadly the constituent members of these hostile armies. To the "secular" school system belong the Unitarians, the

Congregationalists, all Rationalists, Secularists, Universalists, Deists and Atheists, and practically the organisation known as the British and Foreign School Society, of which Lord Russell is the president. It is a large and increasing party.

In support of the "denominational system" are ranked, on the whole, the Church of England, especially its National Society for Education, the Wesleyans and Baptists, and prominently, the Catholic Church.

To the party of compromise are attached such politicians as Lord Granville, the Duke of Marlborough, Mr. Bruce, and many other estimable persons, who hope by this means to get over, for their day, a political difficulty. It recruits largely from the immense host of liberal Latitudinarians who, on the one hand, are still held by their prejudices in favour of some religious creed; and yet, on the other hand, have no deep-seated, soul-stirring belief in the truth of their own or of any other religion. These are men with a religious sense, but it is in a maze; who would not altogether eschew religion, but would not have too much of it. They are men who are attached to the general theory of Church and State, and have an impression that the secular party might dissolve that union, and sweep away Church patronage and preferment. And so they gladly take up with the happy suggestion of "Conscience and Rating Clauses," and declare that this is the clean path out of the difficulty. Men of this sort always abound; probably they are a majority. But men who compromise their principles infallibly end by losing them, because they begin by losing their own firm grasp of them.

It would be making light of the sense and instincts of our Catholic readers to insist at any great length upon the ultimate issues which are involved in this momentous question. It must be obvious to all that, if the State put itself at the head of the "secular" school system, it would thereby become the pioneer of the country back to intellectual paganism: but that if it remain faithful to the principle of religious education, sown deep in our constitution a thousand years ago, it may still preserve the Christian civilization of this country, and at last lead up to that re-union of Christendom which so many desire and pray for.

Such, then, is the momentous question which politicians are hastening the people of this country to consider and decide. It is time that all should awake to a realization of its gravity. We have all of us influence; we have all a voice in the verdict and final judgment to be pronounced by the nation. A direct responsibility, therefore, rests upon every Catholic. We are bound to come to a conscientious decision as to the

course of our future conduct. It too often happens, indeed, in communities and societies in which all have equal rights and powers, that the many are passive and otiose, while the energetic few rule and decide. Nothing can be more disastrous than apathy such as this. Of this temper, Italy is at the present moment a melancholy example. The large masses of the population, inwardly faithful to the Holy See and to the cause of justice, and abhorring the acts of the Italian Government and of the Revolution, are paralysed by the disease of inertia, timidity, and neglect of public duty.

But when the time shall come (and it is at hand) for a trial in this country of the great question of popular education, the Catholics of this kingdom will know how to act. We are confident that they will be found active in general and local meetings, in canvassing for members of Parliament, in elections at the hustings, petitioning Parliament, writing pamphlets, constantly recurring to the use of the press, and, above all, by wisely and heartily co-operating with all the denominations who will work with them. They will make it felt not only that they understand their position, but that they will allow of no public question being agitated without throwing into the scale the full weight of their national rights and undoubted influence.

As to the power of Catholics, when they are determined, on such a public question, no one can doubt it. In the Lords and Commons, and on the Bench, they come next to the Church of England, before all the sects; in the number of poor schools claiming grants from Government, in Great Britain alone, they rank next but one of all the denominations to the Anglican Establishment; and in point of population, five millions of Catholics in Ireland and a million and a half in England outnumber any one of the dissenting bodies, if taken separately.

We purpose, therefore, to fulfil, in some degree, our part of the duty, which devolves upon all Catholics, by sketching out in broad outline the nature of this life-and-death question—the education of the country. We cannot hope to compress all that we shall have to say into one article. In the present number we shall endeavour to answer two questions; the first is—Does a grave reason exist why Government should be pressed to increase the national expenditure on education? And the second—What are the nature and character of the innovating school—that is, of the school wishing to change the existing system? These two questions will occupy all our space. In a future number we shall endeavour to exhibit the working of the American Common school system—it being the type proposed to us by the “Secularists.” Then



will come a more minute estimate of the denominational system, a fuller examination of the "conscience clause" and "rating" system; and the humble expression of our judgment as to the peculiar power and qualification of the Catholic Church to deal with this present question.

# I.

First, then, it is desirable that we should have clearly and distinctly before the mind the great national and judicial evidences of the need which exists for a wide extension of popular education; and by popular education we here mean, not merely the teaching of the head, but the well training of the conscience upon the distinct Christian principles and dogmas of Revelation.

With a view, however, to sparing the time of our readers, we shall simply set down in columns for their reflection certain national facts and figures, which will speak more eloquently than any words of ours. We preface them only with two observations which, we take it, are axiomatic—

1st. That prevention is better than cure; the religious teacher better than the policeman; the school-room better than the gaol;—that it is better to endeavour to train men up to morality and virtue from childhood than to have to catch and punish them for vice in manhood.

2nd. And that, therefore, the Government is called upon to extend a large measure of assistance to the development of that which is the greater public good.

1. (a) The last Annual Report of the Judicial Statistics for England and Wales gives the following results:—

## *Characters known to the Police.\**

Known thieves and depredators	...	...	under 16	...	...	3,823
"	...	...	over 16	...	...	18,983
Receivers of stolen goods	...	...	under 16	...	...	56
"	...	...	over 16	...	...	3,022
Prostitutes	...	...	under 16	...	...	1,197
"	...	...	over 16	...	...	24,717
Suspected persons (not actually convicted)	...	...	under 16	...	...	3,844
"	...	...	over 16	...	...	24,736
Vagrants and tramps	...	...	under 16	...	...	5,955
"	...	...	over 16	...	...	27,236

\* "Known to the police" is by no means an exhaustive account. For instance, Dr. Pusey, in his valuable evidence (July 22, 1867) upon Oxford University immorality, spoke of a list of 17 bad houses in Oxford alone, which were not all "known to the police." The number of such houses in England, of which the police have official cognizance is 20,249.

Moreover, in addition to the above there were actually in prisons,	
&c. ... ..	41,529
Making a total of ... ..	155,095
The total number of commitments to prison, &c., during the year	
had been ... ..	136,741
Cases of summary proceedings before magistrates showed an increase on the preceding year of 22,856 cases, the number	
being ... ..	481,770
The number of plaints entered in County Courts showed an increase on the preceding year of above 180,000 cases ; the number	
being ... ..	872,446

(b) We learn from Dr. Tyler, on his reading the report of the committee on infanticide (Haweian Society),

That the number known to the authorities of illegitimate children	
born in England in 1864 was :— ... ..	47,448
And that in five years (1860–4) they numbered ... ..	227,661
And that in 30 years the population of England increased less than one-third, and the number of illegitimate children more than doubled.	

(c) The coroners' inquests inform us that

The number of verdicts during the past year for murder was ...	272
And that of these cases 166 were of infants under 1 year.	
That the number of cases of suicide was ... ..	1,360
There were also 638 persons arrested for attempt at suicide.	
The number who died from excess of drink ... ..	373
And from "want, cold, and exposure" ... ..	200

(d) As to infanticide, a crime becoming daily more common in England, it is impossible to arrive at anything like an exact estimate.

Dr Lankester, one of the most experienced and learned coroners in	
London, has more than once committed himself to an estimate that the number of children annually murdered after	
birth is over ... ..	4,000

"The most alarming feature," he said, on occasion of an inquest held at the Wellington Tavern, University Street, "was that of the police, seeing the cases of infanticide had become so common, had apparently given up all idea of preventing it, and no longer exerted themselves to discover the perpetrators of such murders."

He spoke of the "unfortunate tendency to ignore its prevalence ;" and the *Times*, in a leading article during the last month, has made a similar affirmation as to the determination to ignore this system of child-murder. Dr. Lankester said

it would appear that 800 such murders were committed annually in London. He suggested the appointment of a female police, and the careful watching and stopping of young women at night carrying suspicious parcels. This system of child-murder and this willingness to ignore it display an amount of moral depravity on the one hand and moral callousness on the other, which is Chinese.

Again, the shocking system of "baby-farming," as it is called, and its numerous advertisements in the daily prints, intelligible only to the initiated, are further signs of the times. But we gladly add that upon this point the press has spoken with becoming severity.

In speaking of the evidences of the want of Christian education, we have been compelled, however reluctantly, to dwell thus passingly upon these frightful and disgraceful topics.

The Royal Commissioners lay it down as axiomatic that the want of education is a fruitful cause of the pauperism which is our national disgrace. Let us therefore inquire what indirect evidence the workhouses can furnish concerning the want of Christian education.

The number of paupers subsisting on workhouse relief, according to the last complete annual Return published by the Poor Law Board (exclusive, of course, of thousands who depend on private bounty and the chances of the day), had increased during the year by 81,175, and had reached the number of ... 963,200

Thus, it would appear that the proportion of our paupers is that of about 1 to every 20 of the population. What other country in Europe has ever had to make a similar confession!

II. And now we come to our more immediately important column of statistics. We obtain them by aid of the 1st volume of the Report of the Commissioners on the state of Popular Education, commonly known as the Duke of Newcastle's Commission. But as this volume bears the date of 1861, we shall correct it by the authority of Mr. Bruce, late Vice-President of the Committee of Education, who has given much time and consideration to the subject during the last session of Parliament.

The population of England and Wales is taken to be ... 21,000,000

It is an axiom of the Committee of Council that one-sixth of the population ought to be at Elementary Schools for the labouring classes; therefore the number of children in actual attendance in Poor Schools ought to be ... 3,500,000

The Duke of Newcastle's Commission tells us [p. 79] that the number of children found in all the Poor Schools of the

country, *i.e.*, in the *public*, the *private*, and *adventure* schools, was 2,213,694. But since that date, Mr. Bruce informs us there has been an increase in the numbers on the school-books, and they may now be reckoned at ... 2,450,000

This leaves the number of children unaccounted for at the large figure of ... .. 1,050,000

But, alas! this is not an adequate representation of the number of children who grow up without education. The number of children on a school register does not represent the number of children attending the school and receiving the benefit of education. The number of days' attendance in the year, fixed by the Committee of Council as a condition for the payment of the capitation grant, is 176. This is the lowest standard of time admitted by the Committee. But let us take it at 150 days' attendance in the year; and term any education under that as *inadequate*.

The Report (vol. i. p. 652) shows that, upon 1,549,312 scholars on the Register, 886,206 do not attend school 150 days in the year. Now, applying this proportion to Mr. Bruce's estimate (2,450,000 on the books), we find that the number of children *inadequately* educated is ... .. 1,401,399

The number of children, therefore, in England *unaccounted for* and *inadequately* educated is ... .. 2,451,000

The statistics drawn up by Mr. Bruce, late Vice-President of the Committee of Education, and relied on by Earl Russell, rather curiously disagree with the defence made by the Duke of Marlborough, who is now in office. For instance, we observe that the Duke derives unmixed consolation from his statement that "the annually aided schools and scholars have been increasing five times as fast as the population." But we must modify this encouraging statement by a very pertinent and important consideration for which we are indebted to Mr. Bruce. He says (p. 6) "that since 1858 there has been an annual average increase of 47,000 children at inspection at assisted schools, whereas the natural increase of population would have given an increase of only 33,000. It has hence been inferred that the ratio of increase in school children is greater than that in the population; but this is a mistake, for the *larger portion* of this increase is due to the conversion of unaided into assisted schools. Probably not one fourth of the increase is an *actual* increase in the number of school children."

It also appears that, according to an educational census taken by the Bishop of London, there ought to be 362,000 children at school in the metropolis. But the return shewed that, including attendants at night schools, there were but 191,147 children

in Church and non-Church schools; and about 170,000 children who ought to be at school, attend no school at all! It also appears that there is a deficiency of school-accommodation for 150,000 of the children who are without education. Of the Anglican parishes or districts 17 had no schools at all, and 108 were urgently in need of more schools. We may here mention parenthetically that considerable results are being achieved by the Archbishop of Westminster through the Westminster Educational Fund. Within a year and a half 2,000 additional Catholic children have been rescued from ignorance and vice and placed under proper Catholic instruction.

The Manchester Education Aid Society has shown that out of above 75,000 poor children in Manchester and Salford there were but 41,000 in average attendance at schools of every denomination. In 1865 the Society canvassed certain districts and reported that for every 52 children at work or at school, 58 were neither at work nor at school.

Dr. Gover, Principal of the Worcester, Lichfield, and Hereford Training College, affirms "that *less than half* our population of school age are being fitted by education for their future duties."

Mr. Stansfeld, certifying surgeon of Bristol, found that "out of 890 children and young persons examined by him, 425 were totally ignorant."

III. (a) A further proof of the ignorance of the population and of how much yet remains to be done, may be drawn from the last complete report of the Registrar-General for 1866. It shows that 28½ per cent. of the couples married during the year were unable to sign their names. And observe, that to sign their own names is an accomplishment possessed by many who can write nothing else.

(b) Of prisoners without a competent knowledge of reading and writing, during the past year, there were about 120,000.

IV. Since we are dealing with figures, it may be as well to give a column of costs. Nothing comes more directly home to the practical Englishman than the knowledge of what he has to pay.

---

NOTE.—In Bethnal Green there were 34½ per cent. unable to sign their names; in Shoreditch, 19½; in Marylebone, 8½; in the City, 19; in Wolverhampton, 47; in Preston, 49; in Salford 40; in Leeds, 31; Birmingham, 30½; Liverpool, 33; in Lancashire, 38; Herefordshire, 33; Monmouthshire, 45; Staffordshire, 45; Wilts, 27½. London and the South-Eastern counties have the smallest per cent., viz. 14½ and 20½; and the West and North Midland the largest, viz. 34 and 36.

Let us ask, then, what may be the sum paid by the State towards the *repression* of crime and disorder; and then compare that sum with what is allowed for popular education, as a means of anticipating and preventing crime.

The following figures are taken from the last Official Returns :—

Police, constabulary, and prisons for England alone ... ..	£2,190,000
(The payment for increase of police and constabulary alone during the last two years has amounted to nearly £80,000).	
The Courts of Justice ... ..	679,803
Now the annual grants made to our Elementary Poor Schools* in England and Wales does not exceed the sum of ...	390,000

It is, moreover, worth while to observe that, in addition to 14 millions a year for the British army, over other 17 millions a year are expended on our Military Force in India; above 10 millions on our Navy; and over half a million a year on National Fortifications. In short, we spend 42 millions, twice the French expenditure, upon inferior armaments, and then declare that we cannot afford even one hundredth part of that sum, not even £400,000 a year, in direct payment to elementary schools. Yet we boast that education is our highest security for prosperity, order, and morality, and our best bulwark against ignorance and crime.

Again, and lastly; why is it that we have to pay the enormous sum of £6,439,500 a year towards the official support of pauperism, while the Government Commissioners assure us that this frightful amount of poverty and suffering might be abated by having recourse to a somewhat more generous expenditure for the education of the poor?

In a word, we spend officially for the maintenance of material force, for the repression of crime and disorder and the alleviation of pauperism, over 50 millions and a half annually. Might not some reduction be made here, and applied to the prevention of evil by increasing the Christian training and education of our people?

V. But in order to obtain anything like an adequate notion of the worse than heathen ignorance prevailing among great masses of our poor children throughout the country, it would be necessary to go carefully through the six vols. of Reports

---

\* We are well aware that the sum allowed by Parliament in aid of education in Great Britain in the year ending March, 1866, was £622,730, but the proportion granted out of this directly to Elementary Schools in England and Wales did not exceed the sum we have mentioned.

of the *Children's Employment Commission* which are now before us (1863-7). The Commission was wisely appointed by Parliament to inquire into the employment of children and young persons (under eighteen years of age) in trade and manufactures.

Through six volumes (writes Mr. Bampffield), from the mouths of master and workman, parent and child, of schoolmaster and clergyman, in scores of cities and towns and villages through the length and breadth of England, there runs one horrible, ghastly tale of utter ignorance of God, of children steeped in immorality, of entire neglect on the part of parents, of avarice, and drunkenness, and blasphemy, and filth, of homes which are not homes at all, but mouths of hell.

We cannot do more at present than take a few examples, selected almost at random from the published evidence—not, indeed, as to the *practice* of religion, but as to the knowledge of *any* religion, even to the knowledge of the existence of God.

First, then, let us begin in London :—

Mary Ann —, employed in a lucifer match manufactory, Bethnal Green (seems *about* fourteen). Does not know how old she is. Never was at school in her life. Does not know a letter. Never went to a church or chapel. Never heard of "England," or "London," or the "sea," or "ships." Never heard of God. Does not know what He does.

The Commissioner remarks :—

This girl, with no outward sign of stupidity, but, on the contrary, rather nice-looking, seemed to have no idea whatever beyond her round of work. She has a mother, and a home, but for some reason which I could not make out, does not seem to have even the change of going there. (First Report, p. 53.)

Sarah — has never been to school in her life. Does not know what London is. *Never heard of God.* (Her sister says she must have *heard father tell of Him.*)

Sarah Ann — used to go to the Ragged School. They used to teach her G—o—d—God. *Did not know what it meant.*

In another factory :—

Joseph — has never been to school anywhere day or week ; has never been inside a church or chapel. Heard somebody preach out of doors last Sunday. He preached about Jesus. Never heard of Him before then. Never heard about God. Never heard father or mother speak about Him or heaven. Does not know where good people go to, or where the bad go. Father or mother never go to any church, or such place (p. 66).

Now to Birmingham—a Percussion cap manufactory :—

Eliza Beckett, aged 15. Does not know any prayers herself. Never heard of Abraham "as she knows of." Has heard of Noah, but never of the



flood, or of all the people in the world being drowned. Thinks she has heard of Adam and Eve, but does not know what they were. (First Report, p. 108.)

Edward Mann, aged 11, works in same manufactory. Can do "some straction and piffatic." Is sure it is "piffatic." "Them sums as have got ever so many figures in" (arithmetic). Goes to church with his mother on Sunday night. Christ was Jesus Christ's son. Jesus Christ did miracles. Christ did not do anything. He was a man first.

Elizabeth Mather—age 12—has heard father say that the first thing Jesus did was to make wine of water, but does not know whether he did kind things to people or made them well.

Joseph Simons—age 21—can't put letters together or spell a word by sound. Not "horse," or "hat." Can "cat," that is about the outside. Never was at a church or chapel since he worked in a frame (9 years ago). Does not know what people preach or hear about there. "I should say he (Christ) done a many kind things," but does not know what people did to Him, or whether they killed Him. They did put Him on a Cross (p. 278).

Let us visit the Nottingham district:—

John Renshaw—age 24—. Has heard people read out of the newspapers, but does not know the Queen's name. . . has been "very little" to church or chapel to hear people pray and preach. (Is asked how the world was made.) "Have not heard about that. Do not know who made it." Has not heard of Adam "a deal."

Alice Coombes—age 26—has not been to school more than once or twice on a week-day in her life, and three or four times on a Sunday. Has been once to church and once to chapel in her life. Has never heard any preacher or anyone praying anywhere else. Does not know what the Bible is. Does not know that it is a book, she is sure. Does not know how the world was made. Never heard of Adam or Jesus Christ. Never was taught any prayers. Never heard of them except when she went to Church (p. 72, Report i.)

The Eastern counties are no better. In a factory at Norwich we find a boy of twelve:—

George—lives with father. Went to an infant school but has never been to any other. Never heard anyone preach or pray in his life. Has never heard of a Christian. Does not know whether he is one or not, or what being christened or baptized is. Not heard of the Gospel or Jesus Christ, or know whether He was a man. Is sure he (that is, his father) can't tell me. "God takes care of people who behave good to him." Does not know who made the world or men, or who was the first man; does not know whether heaven is a good place or a bad place. Has heard people say that good people go there. Has not heard of hell. Has when people are swearing.

Another boy —, went to church a good while ago and heard a preacher. Does not know anything of the Bible, or the Gospel, or Jesus Christ, or Christian. Thinks he is a Christian. When people die "they come to dust." Their

"sould comes to angels," but he ain't heard of nobody : them that don't pray, don't.

Lastly, we must end in Newcastle :

Robert—was at a Catholic school a good bit ago. Was in the street mostly. Learned to read and write, but cannot read or write now. "G-o-d" (in large letters) spells "be." Does not know about him. Has heard say that he was "kaind" and lived up there (pointing). They say "he was a nice man and kaind to us." "He was the first man. Never heard of Adam." Has heard of Jesus Christ that he was "kaind to us and a nice man." They see about that in the Bible. "Has seed a Bible plenty of times in the shops and his own house." "Knowed nicely it was a Bible," though he could not read anything. When people die they gang to Jesus. If they are bad they do the same. It's the same to be good as bad. All gang to Jesus. Mother said that when folks be bad they gang to Jesus. Has heard a prayerman preach in a house (Report i.).

The same deplorable religious neglect and ignorance runs through the whole six volumes. Perhaps the most brutal are the agricultural and brickfield gangs. A foreman in Cornwall says, "the obscenity is shameful. People talk of miners and navvies, but their language is nothing compared to that of men in a brickfield. Of all the language I ever heard, that of *children* in a brickfield is most shocking . . . In fact they are taught sin, and it is the only teaching they get. One boy, a mere child, said that he was made to drink by the men ; he at first refused, but they flung it in his face." A foreman near Southall witnesses "hearing a little boy, not nine years old, say, 'Well, I've been teatotalling for *nine months* ; I must go and get beery now.' He had learnt it, of course, from his father, or some of the men in his field ; but he said it quite seriously, and, no doubt, meant it, too. They are all about the same ;" he adds, "to have seen one field is to have seen all" (Report v., p. 137).

The "brickie" is described as with "utter want of religion or of any religious feeling of any kind, ridiculing religious observances on the Sunday, of sullen demeanor, and filthy, indecent, shameless habits, with disposition to cruelty."

As to the agricultural gangs, much of the evidence is too foul to quote. They were made up of men, women, boys, and girls ; their lives were often simply bestial. Many of them are little better than brutes. A clergyman, in his evidence (Report vi., p. 91), says of them :—

I should think that fully 95 per cent. of those who work in gangs never go to any place of worship ; the fact being that the system so brutalized and demoralized the character that they had no taste for a place of worship. They needed to be civilized before they could be Christianized. I have been to

Sierra Leone, but I have seen shameless wickedness in — such as I never witnessed in Africa.

A hope will naturally suggest itself to our readers that we have culled out solitary instances to make a case. They will think it impossible in a country like England that whole societies of immortal beings, created for the glory of God and the enjoyment of the Beatific Vision, should have become as brutalised and degraded as these examples represent. But, alas ! before the Report of the Commissioners hope itself is compelled to vanish. Listen to an extract from the Third Report. It says :—

Mr. White [one of the most intelligent Assistant Commissioners] then proceeds to give instances elicited by his questions, showing a state of ignorance, among very large numbers of the young, of things of common notoriety, and of the “commonest and simplest objects of nature,” which cannot but arrest attention. But even that obscure and unenlightened condition of mind is surpassed by the ignorance which Mr. White discovered upon religious subjects. “Of very many, he says that the state of mind, as regards the simplest facts of religion, is dark, almost beyond belief” (B. § 85). It is not too much to say that to many *God, the Bible, the Saviour, a Christian, even a future state, are ideas entirely or all but unknown.* God is a “good man,” or “the man in heaven ;” “I’ve heard that (Christ), but don’t know *what it is.*” Nor do others know “where he lives,” or “about the world being made,” or who “made it,” or of the Bible, “it is *not* a book ;” “have not heard of Christ ; I had never done my work till so late ;” “have heard about Jesus Christ, but it’s so long since that I’ve forgot ;” “don’t know if I’m a Christian,” or “what it is,” or “means,” but all people are so. Heaven was heard of only, “when father died long ago ; mother said that he was going there.” Some think that bad and good go there alike ; or, on the other hand, that “them as is wicked shall be worshipped ; that means, shall all go to hell ;” or, again, that when people die, “they be buried ; baint they ;—their souls as well as their bodies ?” “All go in the pit hole, when them be buried ; they never get out or live again ; they have not a soul ; I have not one. The soul does not live afterwards ; it’s quite an end of people when they die.” “The devil is a good person ; I don’t know where he lives.” “Christ was a wicked man.”

The report then proceeds thus :—

In reference to the nature of the answers above quoted or referred to, and the conditions of mind they portray, Mr. White states very correctly that “singly they might be thought exceptional, or not so remarkable ; but their *importance lies in the number.* There may or may not be worse cases ; but at any rate, an indefinite number of the same kind might be added, &c.” Mr. White moreover assures us, “that where ignorance of very simple facts has been professed, I have never assumed it till a *repetition of the question in various words and shapes,* and leading to and almost *suggesting the answer,*

*failed to show any further acquaintance with the matter. . . . As those whose answers are given in detail were taken in most cases without any selection from appearance, and, as a rule, are given equally whether they showed knowledge or ignorance, it may be assumed that the answers fairly represent the general mental condition of the mass*" (P. 61).

One most terrible part of the account is, that in spite of all that has been done, children are *worse* now than in former years.

"There is, I fear," says a jeweller in Birmingham, "less obedience to employers and parents, and less shame in doing wrong amongst the young now than formerly. All seem set on getting money in any way, and youths, and even boys, smoke short pipes and give themselves all the airs of men" (Report iii., p. 119).

"I think the boys that work here," says a foreman in a factory at Manchester, "are worse than boys were twenty years ago; they are worse mannered and more ignorant. The language they use is certainly worse than it was when I was a boy. *It's the parents' fault, all of it*" (P. 188).

A bookbinder in London tells us of the boys employed in his trade:—

"The men have, I think, improved in the last thirty years, but the boys of the present time are *far worse* than the boys were *even ten years ago*."

His foreman agreed with this account, saying—

"That they were *ten times worse* in moral character than boys in the trade used to be, and did not work half so hard. They seem regular young rips and their language is something awful" (Report v., p. 39).

This much must suffice as proof of the want of education in England, and as proof, too, that the education wanted is not merely "secular" instruction, but chiefly religious, and therefore doctrinal education. Much, indeed, has been accomplished for education by the zeal of the denominations. But our evidence shows the necessity for still greater exertion in the same direction; and that a grave duty and a heavy responsibility rest upon our consciences as Englishmen and as Catholics.

## II.

Having made these preliminary statements, we now come to consider in detail the character of the first of the three schools, who recommend to us a particular and distinct system of education. They are called "Secularists." It would be vain to close our eyes to the fact that their numbers are large and fast increasing. They are not indeed strong enough to overcome

the combined forces which are ranged against them, but if they cannot obtain all they require at once, they will aim at a compromise; and in this way insert the narrow end of the wedge, which they will drive home on some future occasion.

Our next remarks may at first appear to be a little wide of our subject, and we must therefore crave the indulgence of our readers, if, for a moment, we seem to digress. But we feel that the public, especially the religious public, have never yet gauged the party which is every day coming up face to face with them; and that it is time that they should do so. In order, then, to realize its *vis et vita*, we must go back to its cradle, even at the risk of being thought mere theorizers. And even at the risk of being accused of injustice towards such men as Earl Russell, Earl Granville, Mr. Lowe, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. J. S. Mill, Mr. Bruce, and other supporters of the "local rating system," and of the "conscience clause," we must draw out the history and trace the real character of the school to which they belong. Some of these gentlemen may be its most moderate representatives. Their worldly wisdom, their plausibility, their tact, their apparent moderation, even the honesty of their convictions, might possibly mislead if regarded as a criterion of the real intentions and tendency of their school. They represent their school economically, not adequately: wait till the masses, who support them and urge them on, come round the corner, and then we shall see what we have really to deal with.

It will help us to understand the general character of the masses if we are able to realize that there is a distinctive, a deep-seated stamp on the nature of every dominant and separate race. This stamp accompanies it through all the phases and circumstances by which it passes the course of its development. It is broadest and most conspicuous in rude and untutored youth; but it is still discernible under the cloak of the most artificial civilisation, and even under the refinement of the Christian character. Grace alone can fairly cope with it, raise and sanctify it, or, if it be vicious, neutralize and almost root it out.

Now, when all the world, except a chosen spot, was in darkness, men made religions for themselves out of their own hearts. Religion was a necessity: but men were "corrupt in their ways," and therefore they "changed the truth of God into a lie and worshipped and served the creature," "and God gave them up to the *desires* of their heart" (Rom. i.). They were "delivered up" to their own inventions and became enslaved. And so two things happened, and a double action occurred; first, races of men changed the truth of God into that particular "lie,"

which was their characteristic : and then they were "delivered up" to it, and worshipping it, they became its slave. The "lie," which had come out of their heart, became branded upon their front, and it sank, like a die, deep into their very nature.

So it happened that throughout the East, in Egypt, Phœnicia, and Syria, Sabiism chiefly prevailed. It was adopted by the Greeks and it passed on to the Latins. It is easy to see that the speculative and passive turn of the Eastern and Greek mind, the love of the abstract and the propensity for the marvellous, favoured this peculiar form of idolatry.

But if we look to the idolatry of the Northern races what do we find? An idolatry wholly different. Their characteristic deities are the gods of war, of conquest, of possession, of the chase, of blood, of feasting. Wodin and Frea and Thor were the divinities of our Saxon forefathers. And their dream for happiness hereafter was the abiding satisfaction of conquest and of the chase by day, and the delights of feasting by night on banquets of delicious viands, of being ministered to by beautiful Valkyriæ, and drinking mead or ale out of the skulls of their enemies, in the palace of Valhalla for ever.

In the idolatry of our ancestors there was something characteristically material, practical, and animal, far different to that of the Eastern, Greek, or even Latin races ; the vein runs through the clay. It is born in the bone. For do we not among ourselves almost touch with the hand in the present day the same thirst for conquest, for possession, for the chase, for material comfort, for eating, drinking, and revelling. Yes, there can be no doubt of it, the paganism of the 19th century in England is of the same lineage, though may be in gentler garb, as the paganism which reigned over flood and field before S. Augustin left the Coelian Hill to plant the cross in Canterbury and to preach the Gospel over the wolds of Kent and Surrey.

Take as representative types of the raw material of our race the gangs of navvies,—broad-backed, powerful animals ;—or the agricultural gangs,—of whose habits and morality the Blue-books at the head of this article make such frightful disclosures, —or the "brickies," the most universally debased in the scale of morality of all our workmen. The common language of these men is filled, not so much with blasphemies and spiritual imprecations, which belong to a more spiritual sense, as with words of the coarsest, foulest, and most bestial meaning. They are flesh and blood and they think and speak of nothing else.

Well, now, this picture of a large mass of our population is sad enough : but let us be truthful. This material, practical, animal paganism is not confined to the working classes.

Mythology has passed away as a fable: Woden, Frea, and Thor are confined as names to the days of our week; but the generic ideal of material and earthly satisfaction, which they represented, is the only one which commands the hearts of thousands and thousands of our middle and higher classes. What is the one ideal of bliss before the minds of thousands, ay millions, in this country? Commercial wealth and prosperity; material ease and convenience; eating and drinking, and other sensualities; the domestic circle of healthy sons and beautiful daughters; successful conquest of nature through scientific research; and, with a certain number, whose paganism rises to a higher level, the cultivation and refinement of the intellectual faculties, and the love of artistic beauty. These are the sensible, tangible, and material gods they worship. But of God, of Heaven and Hell, of grace and the Incarnation, of the Church and her teaching, they know nothing. Their faith is in the present; and the present has absorbed them.

This will sound like the language of exaggeration to the ears of readers who live happily withdrawn from the world, or who come not into contact with the secret poison which is eating out Christianity among not only the masses, but also the middle and higher classes. We are not now about to write an English edition of "*L'Athéisme et le Péril Social*," though the materials for such a work are not wanting. But this we say, that Deism, Pantheism, rationalism, materialism, and practical Atheism are taking such a hold of the people of England as never before. These doctrines penetrate every class. Their votaries are to be found not alone among the open scoffers at religion, but among the educated and refined, among men the least obtrusive of their own opinions, in polite circles, among students and silent thinkers, as well as with the downright radical and the League man.

The well-dressed friends who are exchanging salutations in the square, the men who jostle against you in the busy street, the person who sits beside you in the railway carriage, are probably as estranged from any deep practical belief in Divine Revelation, as the masons you watch working on the wall, or the stream of artisans who are issuing from their dusty workshops, or the sceptical tailors and shoemakers who sit and think, or the threadbare, unwashed, and hungry demagogue, who belongs neither precisely to the middle classes, nor yet to the working classes, nor would he be recognized by the gentlemen of the Press.

All men observe the earnest religious movement which, thank God, is onward: few observe the active growth of



paganism. The former is in fashion, and lives before our eye; the latter carries on its propaganda almost stealthily, and is hardly yet fashionable. It has to accommodate itself to many religious prejudices, to tolerate many formularies which it despises, to do its work of pulling down under pretence of building up reason, humanity, and social happiness. Let us not ignore the cancer because the outer skin is smooth and bright, nor close our eyes to painful facts, because they are partially veiled from our gaze.

That which interests us at the present moment in this school, is that it practically proposes to destroy the denominational and religious system of education, and treats it as the last beggarly relicts of a blind and narrow middle-age superstition. In its stead there is a wish to set up a system which shall be purely secular, intellectual, or material in its aim and results. Its votaries are wise and far-seeing in their plan of operation. If they can reduce education to the basis of a purely secular and State question, they will thereby in time secure the elimination from the mind of the people of the positive dogmas of revelation. And this is the professed aim of many, as we shall presently see.

We have no desire to introduce well known names for the purpose of branding them with materialism, intellectual paganism, positive disbelief in Christianity, in the Trinity, and even in the distinct nature of God. But we cannot omit the names of some of those persons whom this school at present looks up to with benevolence, and with the trust of friendship. Such are Mr. J. S. Mill, Mr. Congreve, Mr. Lowe, Earl Russell, his son Lord Amberley, Mr. J. Bright, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. M. Gibson, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Maurice, Mr. Forster, Mr. Jowett, Mr. Baines, Mr. Bruce, Earl Granville, Mr. Miall, Mr. Potter, Mr. Baker, Colonel Chambers, Mr. E. Jones, &c. Let us take as instances two of these gentlemen who, however much they may protest against the alliance, are actually doing the work of this school.

First, then, Mr. Bruce, the late Vice-President of the Committee of Education, has introduced a Bill of which the avowed principle is "a borough or district rate for the purpose of maintaining existing schools, or, where necessary, of erecting and maintaining new schools," with "a school committee to be chosen from the town council or from the body of ratepayers." "These new schools should be *either denominational or undenominational, as the committee should judge best.*" "We must provide," he tells us, in his pamphlet, "the means by which children of different religious opinions can be educated together." Further on he says, "It is impossible to adhere

strictly to the denominational system." And in order to give proof that the undenominational or secular system is not unfavourable to *religious* development, he has the courage to refer to the state of Wales in the following words: "In Wales, where probably nine out of ten of the working classes belong to Nonconformist denominations, the British Schools, which are undenominational, widely prevail. Would anybody venture to say that the Welsh people were irreligious? The fact is that no portion of Her Majesty's subjects are more regular in the performance of their religious duties, and yet in Wales a large portion of the schools are in fact undenominational."

Now it is hardly necessary to remark that it is notorious that the Welsh, as a people, are the most immoral and the most unprincipled of any in the United Kingdom.

But to continue our analysis. Mr. Bruce would canvass supporters for his measure by informing us that, "speaking for myself in the abstract, I should wish to see popular education conducted where possible in denominational schools;" but then he would conciliate other persons by recommending Mr. Gathorne Hardy not to take the religious question too much to heart, and by begging of him to consider the interests of the Church to which he belongs, as among those "*minor interests*" which are to be "postponed." He distinctly states in so many words that his "measure has been framed with a view to avoid giving offence, even to the feelings which its promoters might regard as *unreasonable*." And it appears that these "unreasonable feelings" are men's strong convictions that the principle of real religious instruction, or the principle of the distinct denominational system must not be repealed or tampered with. Moreover, Mr. Bruce holds that "education can be religious which does not convey the full doctrinal teaching of any specific denomination;" and the opposite conviction is to be ranked among the "*unreasonable feelings*" which he wished to conciliate.

The other leader we shall refer to is Earl Russell. He has adopted in substance the views of Mr. Bruce. But he also would conciliate us by stating that "he should be sorry if it were found necessary not to impart religious instruction in schools;" but presently he adds that "the State has its own duty to perform, which is to *educate* the people of this country *without reference* to their religious opinions." But what is the Earl's theory of the religious instruction which he should be sorry to see prohibited? He does not leave us long in doubt: quoting the words of Archdeacon Denison, that "reading the Bible is not teaching a child religion," "I entirely disagree from that opinion," says the noble earl. "I am myself president

of the British and Foreign School Society, in whose schools the Bible and the Bible alone is taught. They teach Christianity pure and simple." It must be observed, however, that this society plumes itself upon being *undenominational*, and that it is against their rules to do more than read the Bible as an exercise, without note, comment, or explanation.

With whatever prudence and moderation Mr. Bruce, Lord Russell, and several other gentlemen in Parliament may speak, we cannot but regard them as the pioneers, if not the tools and instruments, of a large party which is behind, and scarcely out of sight. Take for instance the views most consistently advocated by many organs of the press—the press is not hampered, and speaks out freely its whole mind. Perhaps the most respectable and influential of its organs is the *Pall Mall Gazette*. These are the words of its leading article December 12, 1867:—

The denominational system is in possession and . . . is radically vicious.

And again :

The truth is, that schools in England are places in which religious or sectarian influence is put first, and in which education is regarded as a means to an end, which end is the propagation and maintenance of various forms of ecclesiastical influence.

In distinct and diametrical opposition to those who hold such language—as “we wish to train these children up to be attached, intelligent, and creditable members of our own, which is the only true Church,”—we affirm that it is highly inexpedient and mischievous to regard education either as an engine for ecclesiastical propagandism or as a matter of charity. We have water-rates . . . police-rates . . . highway-rates . . . and we ought to have education-rates . . . with committees of rate-payers to manage them.

How, then, it may be asked, would a transfer of the managing power from the present governing bodies to committees of rate-payers affect the matter? The answer is, that laymen, representing the wishes of the parents, would approach such subjects from a totally different side and in a totally different spirit from clergymen. They would make the *least of religious differences*, the clergy make the most of them. They would act *chiefly with a view to the temporal advantage* of the scholars. The clergy act mainly with a view to a supposed *spiritual advantage*.

In another leading article the same influential Journal tells us that it would

Reconsider the charitable bequests for education, and take education out of the hands of the squire and the parson; that education is not to be given as by persons claiming an intellectual and spiritual superiority over inferiors; that the school should be managed by rate-payers, as the Police Station and

the House of Correction ; that it cannot be recognized too soon that the time is rapidly passing away for the present state of things.

We thank this powerful organ for the rare virtue of a downright and straightforward policy, which on the whole it consistently enunciates. Such language greatly assists us in getting at the real aims of the school which is endeavouring to win its way. Our right apprehension of the views of a school is to be gained, not so much from political men in power, who have difficult cards to play, as from those who care only to speak out their real intentions and to direct the aim of those who follow them.

The *Saturday Review* holds the same views, but speaks with a tinge of philosophic acumen. It would patiently put up with religious teaching for a little while longer. It recognizes Mr. Bruce as an own-brother. It writes as follows :—

As to religious differences, which *undoubtedly hinder* now, as in earlier days they advanced the spread of education, practical men like Mr. Bruce know that the day has not come for the *purely* secular system.

But the Reviewer beckons on that happy day, and heralds its approaching advent.

But let us proceed. We read in the leading article of another organ—

As for the matter of creeds, settle that among yourselves. We think men and women would be better without them ; but if you think otherwise, teach your children any creeds you like. The instruction which the Government provides shall be purely secular. . . . A purely secular instruction would not only be fair, in respecting the religious convictions of parents, but it would be conducive to the mental advancement of the child. At present theological or religious instruction is pressed on children at far too early an age. Of what use can it be to addle the brains of a child by teaching it to repeat by rote, like a parrot, a creed which no man or woman can really understand ?

A wearying list of extracts similar to the above might be given from the *Examiner*, the *Times*, the *Telegraph*, the *Star*, the *Weekly Dispatch*, the *Reformer* ; and many of the *Quarterlies* which touch the subject treat it more or less from a similar point of view. But still parties are not yet so sharply defined but that there should be much truckling to various opinions, and to the prospects of circulation ; and the *Times* blows hot to-day and cold to-morrow.

We shall not insult our Catholic readers by trying to prove that every man is born into this world for the one end that he may save his soul—that this must be the chief business of his life—that, if all things else succeed and this fail, all is lost.

But as to arguments which should convince pure "secularists," it is difficult to find any, since we are essentially at issue with them on first principles and axiomatic truths. However there is one argument, which we have seen adduced by a journal usually hostile to Catholic interests and principles, but which we think so well put that we shall reproduce it. It is to this effect :—Religion is the only subject of real thought in primary education, the only thing calculated to touch the heart, to raise the mind, and to evoke from their brutish apathy the real elements of humanity, and especially the reason. It is therefore the one indispensable element of primary education. A population unable to read and write, but with a religious cultivation, has before this often constituted, and may constitute again a great nation ; but a population without religious cultivation, however mechanically dexterous and instructed in the elements of literature, has no solid political character. Religion is the widest and deepest of all the constituents of civilization. It reaches those whom none of the other constituents of civilization affect. The writer then proceeds to show that this religion, in order to be an element of education, must be no vague sentiment—no abstract term—but an obligation binding the consciences to a law and a creed. Political science requires that children should be educated not in religion indefinitely, not in a common Christianity, but in a definite religion, and a Christianity with its distinct laws and creed.

But we have not, alas, yet finished with the creed of that vast school which we are describing. The worst has still to be told, as we get deeper into the ranks of the people. With them this particular question of education is but one of many. Their theories as to education are but symptoms of the disease—not the disease itself. Our contention with them is not merely on a question of "educational rates." Our alarm and our sorrow have a deeper reference, and can only be appreciated after an examination of the rationalistic and infidel literature which is circulated among the masses, and shapes their plans and politics. Without speaking of larger and more expensive works of infidelity and rationalism, of which Messrs. Longman could furnish an ample list, we have actually before us a quantity of smaller publications and tracts which are sold, and sometimes distributed gratis, among the artizan and lower classes.

It is important that we should know something of what is working on the minds of the people. We therefore do not scruple to enter into the subject. A large number of infidel works are in constant sale and circulation among the lower

classes. The demand for them has increased so largely, that it has now become customary among their authors to stereotype all they publish.

We must give a few extracts from some of these writings, blasphemous though they are, in order that we may duly appreciate this side of our popular literature. There is a popular tract called "Labourer's Prayer." It begins thus:—

"Give us this day our daily bread" is the entreaty addressed by the tiller of the soil to the "Our Father," who has promised to answer prayer. And what answer cometh from heaven to this bread-winner's petition? Walk among the cotton-workers of Lancashire, the cloth-weavers of Yorkshire, the Durham pitmen, the Staffordshire puddlers, the London dock labourers, go anywhere where hands are roughened with toil, where foreheads are bedewed with sweat of work, and see the Lord's response to the prayer, the Father's answer to His children! The only bread they get is the bread they take; it is their hard struggle for life sustenance, the loaves come but slowly, and heaven adds not a crust, even though the worker be hungry, when he rises from his toil-worn meal. Not even the sight of pale-faced wife and the forms of starveling children can move to generosity the Ruler of the world. The labourer may pray, but, if work be scant, he pines to death while praying. . . . Prayer to the Unknown for aid gives no strength to the prayer. In such beseeching he loses dignity and self-reliance; he trusts he knows not what. Let labour pray in another fashion and at another altar. Let labourer pray to labourer that each may know labour's rights. His prayer must take the form of earnest, *educated* endeavour to obtain the desired result. Let workmen, instead of praying to God, ask one another why wages are low.

Another tract is titled "A Plea for Atheism."

Atheism (it says) properly understood, is in no wise a cold, barren negative; it is a hearty, fruitful affirmation of all truth, and involves the positive assertions and actions of highest humanity.

Then it says:—

God is an abstract word coined to designate the hidden force of nature, or rather, it is a mathematical point, having neither length, breadth, nor thickness.

Of another tract, "Is there a God?" It has sold at the rate of a thousand a month. One specimen, and we spare our readers further blasphemy:—

It is urged that the idea of God is universal. This is not only not true, but I in fact deny that any coherent idea exerts its connection with the word God. George Combe, Volney, and the author of the "*Système de la Nature*," have well explained the origin of the so-called God ideas. The chief object to which the emotions of any people are directed becomes their God. . . . These errors becoming institutions of the country, the people,

prompted by their priests, regarded all those who endeavoured to overturn them by free and scientific thought and speech as blasphemers, and the religion of the State has, therefore, always been opposed to the education of the people.

Other tracts are: "Has Man a Soul?" which has already gone through nine editions. "Who was Jesus Christ?" "Jesus, Shelley, and Malthus." "The Bible; what it is: being a Freethinker's Commentary." "God, Man, and the Bible; three nights' discussion with the Rev. Dr. Baylee." "Christianity and Secularism contrasted; two nights' debate with W. Hutchings, Esq., at Wigan." "Why do Men Starve?"

The "Baylee debate" has had an extraordinarily large circulation; and Mr. Holyoake has sold nearly 50,000 of the "Logic of Death"—a horrible work. The sale of such literature among the masses is rapidly increasing; and the mischief it works, like a poison in the soul, is not to be estimated. We learn, not only from abundant public evidence, but also from a reliable private source—from a person who, unfortunately for himself, has had for years the best means of forming an accurate judgment—that "*Atheism proper* is certainly and most decidedly rapidly increasing. I judge this," he says, "especially from the applause of the largest audiences, and my general correspondence with English atheists," &c.

These samples may suffice to give an idea of the food which is being served out with untiring zeal to tens and hundreds of thousands all over the country. And we may add from our own personal knowledge that there are three or four establishments in London alone, where printing presses are exclusively engaged on these and kindred publications; and that there are men whose one business is their circulation. Besides this, there are lecture rooms or halls scattered through the more populous cities of the country, in which the "Secularists," as they call themselves, and their friends, hold forth of an evening for the people, and distribute their poisonous doctrines. We happen to know of thirteen such halls in London alone—and there are many more. The admission is generally free, or the charge is but 1d. The advertised topics for lectures are such as the following: "The Secular View of the Future;" "The Lies of Religion;" "The Prophet of Nazareth: an inquiry into the character of Jesus Christ;" "The Religion of Action;" "Crimes of the Bible God;" "Secular Education for the People;" "Secularism and the Soul;" "The Festival of the Dead, or what we owe our Ancestors." One Hall advertises a "Positivist Class; no charges." Then there are regular societies and organizations,



of which, by way of specimen, we may mention :—"The London Secular Eclectic Society;" "South London Secular Society;" "North London Open-air Secular Mission;" "Paddington Secular Society;" "Religious Discussion Society." These societies often form benefit societies and so make proselytes.

The average attendance at the secular or Free-thought meetings in London alone each Sunday is set down by the best authority on this subject at about 1,200. There are at least thirty such meetings held every week throughout the country. Wherever such lectures are given by Mr. Bradlaugh, the leader of the Atheist school, the audiences, it is said, are crowded and the large majorities evidently favourable. The greatest extension of secularist views appears to be in Lancashire and Yorkshire, where large numbers may be found in every town; next probably in London; then in Newcastle and its neighbourhood; then in Glasgow; next in Northampton, where the great popularity of extreme Free-thinking views is of recent date. To listen to such lectures audiences of 700 persons will meet in the London halls, which are small. In Northampton the Theatre, when hired for the purpose, holds about 600. The attendances at Huddersfield average 1,000; at Bradford, 600; at Leeds rather less; at Halifax, 800; at Newcastle, 800. At Liverpool, Birkenhead, Birmingham, and other places the largest halls obtainable for the purpose are filled.

Not only religious or anti-religious subjects are discussed in these meetings, but a great variety of topics of social, or political, or scientific interest to the class of hearers who frequent them. Discussions and debates, which always enliven the proceedings, are much encouraged; and often one subject forms the topic of debate for five or six nights.

We know of one occasion in which the lecturer, after developing his atheistic thesis before some hundreds of young men and women of the lower, middle, and mechanic class, took out his watch, said he would put his teaching to a practical test, and summoned God to vindicate his character and prove his existence, if he had any, by striking him dead within five minutes. A dead silence came over all; the minute hand passed on, and the lecturer proceeded triumphantly with his atheism.

The authorities which lecturers of this sort seem to quote with greatest respect are, besides such writers as T. Paine, Geo. Combe, Volney, and infidels of the French school, Mazzini, Congreve, and Mr. S. Mill. They take encouragement in their infidelity from the infidelity and rationalism of large numbers in the higher classes, who are deterred,

they say, only by human respect, fashion, and money interests from openly declaring their opinions.

The enrolled members of the secular societies are few compared with those who are members unattached: for this there are several reasons, such as the odium and loss in business which sometimes attend the avowal of these opinions. The *Times* on one occasion, viewing the matter of religion from a mercantile point, said truly that "there is no point in which *men of business*, desirous to alienate no customers, will be more careful than to exhibit all possible respect for the Bible." Unfortunately, this is less exact now than five years ago, when these words were written.

We have furthermore ascertained that the *National Reformer*, the organ of this school has in spite of the objections of respectable newsvendors to keep it on their counters, in spite of the absolute refusal of many booksellers to supply it, and of the pressure very properly often put upon those who expose it for sale, a larger circulation than either of our two old-established Catholic journals. And the *Reformer* has been only eight years in existence.

Other dark and hideous lines might be added to this picture. We are conscious that we have but, as it were, chipped a corner off the plaster of the social sepulchre, round which all day long we are walking about and over, and rubbing against, without our knowing it. But we have, perhaps, done enough to point out the real character, scope, and end of the national party which is now calling for measures of "secular education." The respectable exponents of the theory are not likely, as we have said, to shock friends (whom they wish to secure) by an exhibition of their principles in their ultimate analysis. Nor, indeed, do we believe that they themselves contemplate and consciously adopt the conclusions contained under their premisses. But, be it observed, although individuals may be illogical and inconsistent, a national party cannot long be so. And to learn the drift of a national party, there is nothing like going down into the mind and will of its masses. They speak a coarse and uncultivated tongue: but they have no reticences, no economies, no guarded prudences, such as are needed by those who move in higher circles.

But let us suppose for a moment that the secularists were to so far win the day as to obtain a "local rating Education Bill;" that the management of the schools, as the *Pall Mall Gazette* says, was entrusted no longer to the clergy who represent religion, but to a Committee of ratepayers who represent temporal ends. Let us suppose that they overthrow the

policy inaugurated by the Committee of Council in 1839; and that they first carry Mr. Bruce's Bill, which is framed as far as possible "to avoid giving offence"—a Bill in which he avers that his method is "to proceed gradually and cautiously;" or let us suppose that Lord Russell's four resolutions become, as he intended, the educational programme of his party, what would be the natural consequences?

We believe then that the natural consequences would be (1) shocking as it may be to say so, that to attach the Royal signature to such a measure would be to sign the national apostacy from Christianity. A country which adopts and proclaims the principle of education without religion, proclaims the destruction of religion and its own apostacy.

(2.) It would be the formal return of the nation, through an act of its Legislature, to an unmythological Paganism.

(3.) It would be the eradication of the last great Catholic principle which still remains rooted in the foundations of our time-honoured Constitution. That principle was supported by Lord Derby when he declared in the words of Chief Justice Twining, in the time of Henry IV.:—"La doctrine et information des enfants est chose spirituelle;" and in the later decision of Chief Justice Holt in the time of William III., that "without doubt, schoolmasters are, in a great measure, intrusted with the education of youth in principles, and therefore it is necessary they should be of sound doctrine." This declaration was a corollary. But to what great principle was it a corollary?—to no other than to this, that the education of man is the education of an immortal soul, and that the secular arm has a duty to acknowledge and protect the spiritual arm. It is the principle embodied in the union of those familiar words, "Church and State."

This is a question for the serious consideration of the Anglicans rather than for ourselves. It is certain that, if the nation divest the higher education of the land of a religious character, by throwing open the government and instruction of the universities to Free-thinkers, Jews, and Atheists, and then most consistently declare that the primary school system shall, like that of the universities, be secular and not religious, it will not be able to halt and stop short of its next legitimate conclusion?

And what would that be? It would be the destruction of the national Church. If the State does not pay for the religious instruction of children, why should it pay for the religious instruction of adults? If it is the duty of the State, as Lord Russell avers, "to educate the people without reference to their religious opinion," how can it be the duty of the

State to pay for the maintenance of religious opinions? In a word, Liberals and Radicals, and all who may be educated under the secular system, will demand as a logical and just conclusion the destruction of the national Church. They will say we have godless universities, godless colleges, and godless schools. Let the State be also godless, and sweep away towards secular purposes the eight or nine millions\* a year which are paid to a national Church. The educational scheme of the secularists would inflict a blow indeed upon all forms of religion, but on the national Church it would be the blow preparatory only to its death-blow.

(4.) It would be the beginning—and this is a point not contemplated by its more respectable abettors—of the break-up of our empire. Banish religion, and you let loose disorder and revolution. And be sure that the break-up of the British Empire, with its dense population and brutal passions, would be second only for anarchy, horror, and immorality to the last days of the Roman Empire, which we already in more than one respect resemble.

Now, if we have taken a serious view of the state of parties in England, especially in reference to the vital question of education, let it not be supposed that we are alarmists. The country is not yet swallowed up in the rising waters of unbelief and rationalism. The secularist party is not yet so stiffly organized but that it may be constitutionally kept under by joint action, and its influence neutralized by the means, which we must defer speaking of to a future article.

At present the secularist school is a gulf stream through the nation rather than a deluge submerging it. They who have sped across the Atlantic know the character of the gulf-stream. It has a colour, a density, and a temperature differing from the waters through which it passes. It runs out of its basin at the rate of five or six knots an hour. It stems tides and ocean currents, and passes on from the torrid to the frozen zone. It is the scene and the cause of continual storms and wrecks. It possesses no real growth or vegetation of its own, but it bears along with itself the products, the mosses, the seaweed, even the timbers of the tropics, and every floating fragment which drifts within its current; and these in time are ruthlessly stranded on the frozen shores of Newfoundland, or on the dark coasts of Iceland and the Hebrides.

And so we look upon it, that the secularist party, formed of Radical and Rationalist elements and of the scoffers at revela-

---

\* From a calculation made by the Count de Casabianca.

tion and obedience, are but as a gulf-stream through the length of the nation. We hold it, indeed, as certain that it will carry away, absorb in its drift, and eventually strand upon the shores of unbelief, almost without their knowing it, those whose hearts and convictions are not strongly moored to the principles of religion and revelation. The only hope that we can see for such as these is that, having but slender religious, they may have deep political feelings, which will serve, for a time at least, to bind them fast to the great Conservative interests of religion.

On the other hand, it cannot be doubted that a strong, though vague and undeterminate, religious feeling is spread and fostered throughout the country; that the undenominational and secular system, as represented by Lord Russell's British and Foreign School Society and by the Birkbeck Schools, has not yet taken any very deep hold upon the people. Nor can it be doubted that, to uphold the great principle of religious education, Catholics, Anglicans, Wesleyans, and all men who earnestly believe in the principle of a dogmatic Revelation, can work together; and that, if they will it, they can carry Parliament and the country with them.

Consider the position of the country at the present moment:—the lower classes have fallen into formidable organizations against their employers. The Trades' Unions, we are told, have "embittered the relations subsisting between employers and employed; the breach is perpetually widening; the antagonism between the interests of capital and labour ever increasing. The affirmative evidence on this point is remarkably unanimous." Mr. G. F. Trollope declares in his evidence that there used to be in his younger days some sort of attachment between employers and employed, which has disappeared under the influence of the Unions. In consequence chiefly of this, supremacy in our chief national trades is passing into the hands of nations on the Continent. "I am sorry to say," observes Dr. Lyon Playfair in his letter to Lord Taunton, "that, with very few exceptions, a singular accordance of opinion prevailed that our country had shown (in the examination of the Paris International Exhibition of 1867) little inventiveness and made but little progress. . . . Out of ninety classes there are scarcely a dozen in which pre-eminence is unhesitatingly awarded to us." And Mr. T. O. Murray (note "Reports on the Classes"), in speaking of French cotton manufactures, says, "for excellence of quality and of make we have no cotton stuff for the million at all resembling in it real goodness of quality. . . . Anything for us like an extensive empire or undisputed sway in

the cotton trade is no longer possible." Our chief trades are passing into the hands of Belgium, France, Prussia, Austria, and Switzerland—and that principally through the action of our Trades' Unions.

We remark upon these facts only to draw attention to the jeopardy and suffering to which the great masses of this country are hurrying, and to the importance of providing against the crisis. It is estimated that the labouring population receive at least £144,000,000 sterling in wages; another estimate by Professor Leone Levi makes the amount to be £418,000,000. Now, if the tendency of the Trades' Unions is to destroy the immense trade of this country and to transfer it to the Continent, whence will be drawn the hundreds of millions for the payment of wages to our workmen? And if they are not paid, and the resources used during the cotton famine fail also with the capital of the country, how terrific will be the internal revolution which will inevitably follow! Surely, then, if religion has any power over the heart of man—if it has any influence to still the passions and to inspire humility in prosperity and patience in adversity, every effort should be made while there is yet time to consolidate our national education upon the religious basis, and to accustom our people to turn their minds to God before the dark day of trial comes, when God will have appeared to have withdrawn His hand from our nation.

But worse even than trades' unions, we have growing up around us leagues and revolutionary associations—the brethren of Mazzini, Garibaldi, Louis Blanc, and the blasphemous revolutionists of the continent of Europe. The masses are sapped by scepticism and infidelity, and are penetrated with "hatred of the Churches"—and we are told that in many large populations not above 1 in 500 are baptized or attend any place of worship. The Reform Bill has raised many of these to a political power in the kingdom, and their views on education are certainly not higher than those of Mr. J. S. Mill, Mr. R. Lowe, and others who maintain absolutely the *purely secular* system. In the presence, therefore, of such dangers threatening us ahead—of dispositions so hostile to religion pervading great masses of the people, does not an imperative duty weigh upon every Catholic to take his part in the coming struggle, and to endeavour by every means within his power to secure the permanence of the denominational or religious system? Who need it more than those who protest against it? Whose children are more completely dependent upon us, for their welfare and for our peace, than the children of those who reject the teaching of Christianity,



and appeal first to the "goddess of reason," and then to the authority of brute-force and violence?

A few months ago the present writer was speaking to three or four stalwart and intelligent working-men; they declared, that "the upper classes had taught them to read and write, and that now they should *govern* them no longer. We have learnt our rights, and will secure them by force."

We have endeavoured in the course of this article to point out the real necessity for increased education, and we think that we have shown cause why that education should be made to rest upon the religious basis. We have exhibited in outline, we are fully conscious how imperfectly, the policy and ultimate end of the school which is endeavouring to revolutionize the denominational system now in possession.

We believe every reflecting mind will see the gravity—the solemnity, we had almost said—of the cause which is at stake. When Parliament meets, some of those who work in harmony with the secularist movement intend to endeavour to carry either Mr. Bruce's bill or another tending even further in the same direction. It is the wish, however, of many of perhaps the more long-sighted Liberals, to wait for a new Parliament, and not to commit the State to a legislative enactment on popular education until the large number of "secular" and radical reformers, who are expected to come in with the next session, shall have increased their power, and turned the balance in their favour.

Whatever may be the course of events, it is the duty of all who are in earnest for the maintenance and spread of their religious convictions—whatever they may be—to watch that course closely; and not only to watch, but to come forward, to act, and to take a part in guiding it.

We believe that the Anglicans, who have in their hands above 19,000 poor schools in the country, and are represented by the "National Society for Education," intend to put every legitimate pressure upon the Government—1st, to maintain the present denominational system; 2nd, to extend and increase its efficiency by making payments, not merely to certified but to uncertified schools, upon the principle of *payment for results*; these results to be determined to the satisfaction of a Government inspector. They moreover protest against the introduction of the "Conscience Clause" and of "Educational Rates," as destructive of the voluntary system, as subversive of the religious principle, and as inaugurating among us a system of American education. On these points, we understand that the Wesleyans, who rank next to ourselves in their



number of schools and scholars, feel with equal earnestness.\* Is it not, therefore, our interest as well as our duty to combine for the maintenance of a true, a fundamental, and a Catholic principle? for a principle which appertains very far more essentially and characteristically to Catholicism than to the other forms of religion which contend for it?

---

ART. VI.—TIZZANI ON S. CYPRIAN.

*Saint Cyprien et l'Eglise d'Afrique du III<sup>e</sup>. Siècle.* Par Mgr. l'Abbé FREPPEL. Paris : A. Bray. 1865.

*La Célèbre Contestation entre S. Etienne et S. Cyprien.* Par Mgr. VINCENT TIZZANI. Traduit de l'Italien par M. l'Abbé J. Ranvier. Paris : Adrien Le Clerc et Cie. 1866.

“CYPRIAN, that religious Priest and glorious witness of God, composed many works, whereby may survive the memory of so worthy a name; the abundant fecundity of his eloquence and of God's grace in him, so widely spread itself in copiousness and richness of speech, that perchance even to the end of the world he will speak on.” Thus speaks the deacon Pontius,† faithful friend and biographer of S. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage. His fame is of a peculiar kind. A convert in middle age, when conversion is a true holocaust of the heart, a rhetorician who carried his skill and reputation from the academies to the altar and the synodical hall, a man whose hot nature glows unmistakeably in the relics we possess of his genius, he strove hard, as a bishop, in his lifetime, and perhaps accomplished more by his glorious death. No Christian Church in the world has so utterly passed away as the Church of Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania. Its glorious traditions will always give it a prominent place in the history of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries; but as we read the annals of its bishops, its martyrs, and its councils, it requires an effort of the imagination to feel that the land, wherein Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine lived and spoke, still exists under the names of Tunis and Algeria. The famous empire-city of Carthage,—Phœnician, Punic, Roman, Vandal,

---

\* “Report of the Commissioners on the State of Popular Education,” vol. i., p. 592.

† Oxford Translation.

and Byzantine,—is now buried in the sandy soil, its limits disputed, and its harbours—the classic subject of many pages of history—choked up with silt and ruined masonry. The proconsul's country house at Sexti, where Cyprian was beheaded, and the Magalian suburb, whither his body was transported “with prayer and great pomp, with wax tapers and funeral torches,” to its burying-place “near the fish-ponds,” are now, not improbably, occupied by the gardens of the wealthy citizens of Tunis. A French chapel, dedicated to S. Louis, in the old citadel (touching reminiscence of the last crusade), and the beginnings of a new Church in the neighbouring Algeria, serve to bring out more distinctly the complete disappearance of the Church that once multiplied its episcopal sees from the Great Syrtes to the pillars of Hercules, and planted its temples on every fertile spot of the mountain terraces that descend from the desert to the Mediterranean Sea.

What S. Cyprian has left us is not much, but his peculiar eloquence and the value of his testimony to faith and discipline will always make it very important. His instructions on prayer, patience, almsgiving, and other Christian virtues are such as converts from Paganism would most require, and are therefore confined to what we should consider elementary matters. His treatise on the Lord's Prayer, though made much of by S. Augustine in his controversies on grace, is disappointing to one who looks for something corresponding to what has been left by Origen or Cassian; like Tertullian's book on the same subject, it is confined to vocal prayer. His exhortations to martyrdom and his praises of peace and charity are in great part a cento of citations from the Holy Scriptures; though now and then in the course of his exposition he rises to great eloquence; as, for example, in the peroration of the treatise *De Zelo et Livore*, which may be cited as a specimen of the nervous African style not easy to be surpassed. His best known work, thanks to modern controversy, is that *De Unitate Ecclesie*, in which, notwithstanding some disputed readings, even non-Catholics recognise that he grounds the unity of the Church upon the office of S. Peter. As a witness to dogma, his great service has been his assertion of the Church's unity, against heretic and schismatic. But whilst thus zealous for unity, he was not always sound in the arguments he used to prove its obligation. If we are to accept as genuine all that goes under his name in the “re-baptizing” controversy, it is evident that he was much more zealous than well advised.

The Abbé Freppel, in the volume of his rhetorical prelec-

tions, entitled *S. Cyprian and the African Church in the Third Century*, enters into an elaborate detail of the life, writings, and times of the holy martyr. In his easy and flowing style he analyses the works and characterizes the style of the Bishop of Carthage. If the book has a fault it is that of indiscriminate praise. In reviewing Clement of Alexandria (see DUBLIN REVIEW for January, 1867, p. 233), M. Freppel found himself at liberty to blame; perhaps because he had proved to his satisfaction that Clement had no right to the prefix of "Saint." Even in appreciating S. Cyprian's conduct in his difference with S. Stephen, he is so mild and smooth that one can hardly help thinking he has not quite grasped the difficulties of the "situation." Still, like his other volumes, this is a valuable and complete literary history of an important Father of the Church, presented in an interesting form and in well-written language, trustworthy as far as a professedly literary work can be when its subject has to deal with the two or three difficult controversies that are mooted regarding the works of S. Cyprian.

Monsig. Tizzani's volume, the French translation of which by the Abbé Ranvier is named at the head of this notice, is of a very different sort. It is an elaborate attempt to prove that the whole history of the contest between S. Cyprian and Pope S. Stephen is a series of corrupt forgeries. The author is not new to his subject. He relates feelingly how, when yet in the schools, and listening to the prelections of Palma and Del Signore, he had to sustain the very thesis against which his present work is directed. No sooner, however, was he his own master, than he began to interrogate the documents of the case. As early as 1838 he publicly expressed his doubts. Twenty years later he thoroughly reconsidered the whole of the evidence. Urged, he tells us, partly by the calumnies and misrepresentations which he saw fastened upon the Holy See and passing into history under the very eyes of his own generation, partly by the discovery of figures of SS. Cornelius and Cyprian in the crypt of the cemetery of Calixtus, he carefully and impartially weighed all the documents and history, from S. Cyprian's time to that of S. Augustine, and arrived at the conviction that Donatist or other heretical impostors were to blame for the whole of a story which has been so damaging to the memory of S. Cyprian, and so troublesome to Catholic apologists of every age. His arguments may be briefly summed as follows:—

The documents relating to the Cyprianic question are the following:—1. S. Cyprian's letter to the Bishop of Numidia. 2. His letter *ad Quintum fratrem*. 3. His letter to Pope

Stephen. 4. His letter to Jubaianus. 5. S. Stephen's Decree. 6. S. Cyprian's letter to Pompeius. 7. His letter to Magnus. 8. His letter to Firmilian. Besides these there have to be considered the three Carthaginian councils in which the subject is treated, and the various writers, contemporary or otherwise, who speak of it or the contrary: the principal of these being the deacon Pontius, S. Cyprian's biographer, and S. Augustine, against whom the Donatists freely used the authority of the great Bishop of Carthage. First, then, did Cyprian, in council, address to Januarius and the other Numidian bishops, the letter in which we first find clearly stated that heretics must be re-baptized, or rather baptized, as having before been baptized by heretical ministration, which is invalid? Monseigneur Tizzani answers without hesitation in the negative. It appears from S. Cyprian's own words that the Numidian bishops not only knew perfectly well what he calls the Catholic rule of re-baptizing, but on every occasion acted up to it. How then could either they ask, or he answer, a question as to the propriety of a practice which they both admitted, and which each party knew that the other knew? Moreover, look at S. Cyprian's reasoning in this letter. He uses an argument which, if it proved anything, would prove that no one, not in a state of grace, can validly confer a sacrament, an argument which would destroy the visible Church. Surely the great and learned Cyprian can never have argued thus. At the same time, we know that the Donatists could have argued so and did argue so. Lastly, in his citations of Holy Scripture, the author of this letter is grossly unfair, perverting the sense of passages, the meaning of which he must have known perfectly well. This was another habit of the Donatists.

Then comes the letter *ad Quintum fratrem*. Whoever *Quintus frater* was, it seems clear that his bishopric was near enough to Carthage to have enabled him to know the African custom about baptism: why then should he have asked the question which the letter states that he did ask? Holy Scripture is dealt with in this letter more unscrupulously than in the former. The writer quotes, "*Qui baptizatur a mortuis, quid proficit lavatio ejus?*" (Ecclus. xxxiv. 30). Now, S. Cyprian must have known perfectly well that this text had no connection whatever with baptism, but was simply a warning to those who had undergone a legal purification after touching a corpse, not to touch it again under pain of the former washing becoming useless; as indeed every one else would have seen at once if four words had not been wilfully left out; for the full text runs thus: "He that is washed from the

dead and again toucheth him, what availeth his washing?" Surely S. Cyprian cannot have been guilty of this.

Next comes the letter to Pope S. Stephen. Monsig. Tizzani finds several contradictions in it. Its tone towards the Pope is affectionate and respectful, and therefore very different from that of the letter to Quintus, in which (he considers) the writer has violently attacked S. Stephen, though without mentioning his name. But then, why write to S. Stephen at all? Was it merely to inform him of the decisions of the Council just held? No; for the writer expressly says he writes for advice and consultation. Was it to win the Pope to the African practice? No; for the writer seems not to expect any such consummation. Was it, finally, to obtain the sanction of the Head of the Church, in order that the decision of the African Council might become universal law? Again, no; for he declares that he wishes to bind no one, but to let each one answer for himself to the Lord.

The letter to Jubaianus is somewhat similar to that addressed to Quintus. The same question is answered in the same way, and the arguments used are nearly the same, though set forth at greater length. Monsig. Tizzani finds in it the same difficulties as in the other. The writer argues against a certain letter enclosed to him by Jubaianus, which appears to have been going the round of the African Church. That letter had apparently quoted "custom" against the practice of the re-baptizers. S. Cyprian (if he wrote the letter now under consideration) answers that such an argument is worthless, "as if custom were greater than truth! Or as if that were not to be followed in spiritual things, which has been revealed by the Holy Spirit, as the better way." This seems to savour of modern rationalism. The letter ends with a protestation that each one may do as he sees best; a modest and humble conclusion, after so much argument, vehemence, and intolerance.

The celebrated decree of S. Stephen, *nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est*, only exists as cited in the letter of S. Cyprian to Pompeius, which is the next on the list. This decree itself is only a fragment of a longer epistle, of which only one or two other fragments are known to exist. It seems in itself suspicious that S. Jerome, in his book *de Viris Illustribus*, should not have alluded to Pope S. Stephen at all, though his order would seem to have required it. Surely this important dogmatic epistle must have been in existence in the Roman archives, and accessible to the secretary of Pope Damasus. But the decree itself, continues our critic, will not bear examination. Is it probable that a Pope would have

quoted the example of heretics to confirm his own opinion? Is it not an error of fact that heretics did not re-baptize? Is it not a still graver error of doctrine to say that *no* heretic must be re-baptized? Now, it was in this sense that the contemporaries of the Pope himself understood this letter. These improbabilities, coupled with the fact that no one but Pompeius appears ever to have seen it, seem to warrant our rejecting this alleged decree as imaginary. As for the letter to Pompeius itself, in which S. Cyprian is said to attack it, it contains so much downright abuse of the Pope, that even if S. Cyprian had considered S. Stephen to be in the wrong, and therefore opposed him, yet he would have contradicted both the Apostle S. Paul and his own principles, expressed in this very letter, if he had ever written such intemperate invective. Nay, it would seem to follow, from more than one passage, that the writer actually makes out S. Stephen to have erred in matter of faith. Could this be S. Cyprian, who had on a former occasion, called the Roman Church the chief of all churches, the source of all sacerdotal unity? \*

The letter to Magnus was, like those already considered, an answer to a question. Monsig. Tizzani considers it to be partly genuine and partly forged; that is to say, he thinks, the portion forged which relates to rebaptizing. His reasons are much the same as those already given.

The letter of Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the friend of Origen, may be said to form part of the documents relating to the Cyprianic question, because it is addressed to the holy bishop and purports to be an answer to a letter received from him. Its vehemence and indecency against S. Stephen far exceed anything in the epistle to Pompeius; in fact, they could only be excused—in a bishop—by a conviction that he is speaking of an undoubted and dangerous heretic. To read it reminds one of nothing so much as of one of Luther's diatribes, except that it is a good deal duller. Anything more contradictory to what we know from other sources about Firmilian, can hardly be conceived, except some of the contradictions which this controversy fastens on S. Cyprian himself. Our critic argues at length on the absurdity of supposing Firmilian to have written any such letter. The Greek original no one pretends to have seen or heard of. The Latin translation is attributed, gratuitously, to S. Cyprian. From beginning to end it has the marks of Donatist manufacture about it. Moreover, in the period between the last council of Carthage and the beginning of the winter, when the return-

---

\* Ep. ad Cornelium (lv. al lix., 18).

messenger started from Cæsarea, there was not time for a journey from Carthage to Cæsarea. This last point is worked out with some ingenuity.

The remainder of Monsig. Tizzani's work is occupied with attempts, more or less successful, to get rid of the testimonies of Eusebius, of S. Jerome, of S. Augustine, &c., and in arguments derived from the silence of those who ought to have mentioned the dispute, such as the deacon Pontius, S. Denis of Alexandria, and others.

We cannot pretend to have done justice to Monsig. Tizzani's arguments in this brief analysis, but we must as briefly express our opinion of their value. We must confess that they do not convince us. His reasoning ranges itself under four or five heads. First of all, the interrogations on the part of S. Cyprian's correspondents must be shams, for they must have known what they inquired about. But, is it not quite possible, or rather quite certain, that all were not unanimous in the practice of rebaptizing, and that the agitation of the dissentient bishops may have caused the others to write for fuller confirmation to the metropolitan? Then, as for the false reasoning and perversion of Scripture texts, it may doubtless be plausibly maintained by non-Catholics that S. Cyprian held doctrine on the subject of the unity of the Church which, if logically developed, would lead to the destruction of the visible Church. We say, if logically developed; for S. Cyprian himself not only proclaimed the visibility of the Church, but held that external union with the Church was a sort of sacrament which might make up for the want of baptism itself. Yet the Donatists, even if we could prove all the writings on the Baptism question to be forgeries, would have had almost as much to rely upon in a single passage from the *De Unitate Ecclesie*,\* and S. Augustine's seven books *de Baptismo* would have been quite as necessary, though perhaps a little shorter. Little can be proved from the way the texts of Scripture are handled. There was a recognised practice in early times of appealing to an allegorical, or even sometimes to a commentatitious sense, which often depended on traditions of whose authoritativeness we cannot at this time judge.

Perhaps one of the most staggering things, at first sight, in this memorable controversy, is the reiterated protest made by S. Cyprian that, in spite of his own convictions, he wished every one to be free to follow the dictates of his own conscience. How could a bishop ever have allowed this, on a

---

\* XI. See the Abbé Freppel, p. 380.



point of such vital importance as baptism? Would not such diversity of practice have admitted into the Church thousands of persons, who, in S. Cyprian's opinion, would have been unbaptised, and who would have, accordingly, lived and died without the sacraments, and without the power of conferring them on others? And could S. Cyprian have called this an open question? Yet he seems to have done so. He seems to have looked on the whole dispute as not involving anything more than a point of discipline. It is somewhat difficult to place ourselves at this point of view, and we have not seen any writers who do so to our complete satisfaction. Perhaps, however, some light may be thrown on the question by the following considerations:—

Baptism, among its other effects, has three principal ones, to cleanse away sin, original and actual, and to admit to Church-membership. Of course, S. Cyprian admitted all three. Yet it is also true that the remission of original sin by baptism, in other words, the question of infant baptism by heretics, scarcely comes up in all these discussions. S. Cyprian speaks of nothing but remission of actual sin and of Church-membership; that is to say, explicitly, for we are far from denying that he includes remission of original sin in his frequently repeated phrase of "spiritual birth." His question, therefore, was, Does heretical baptism remit the sins of a grown-up man and make him a member of Christ's Church, out of which there is no salvation? He answers in the negative. Now, it is evident that this answer is, in the case of a subject who is a formal heretic, correct enough. If a Pagan applies for baptism to a sect which he ought to know is heretical, he is, until he repents, none the better for his baptism. S. Cyprian therefore said, "Heretical baptism implies heresy; it can neither forgive sin nor admit to the one Church. But a person whom baptism has not forgiven, nor made a member of the Church, is an unbaptised person; therefore, he must be re-baptised, or rather, baptised." This was wrong, and the reasons that supported it were wrong also, though S. Augustine himself confessed that if it had not been for the voice of authority he would in all likelihood have yielded to them. But this is not the question. The question is to see how S. Cyprian could regard the re-baptising dispute as one about a point of discipline. Now S. Cyprian has nowhere declared, so far as we are aware, that an infant baptised by heretics would be excluded from the kingdom of heaven. His *reasoning* would lead to this, granted; but the question was not raised. He was speaking of the great question of his day, the conversion of adult heretics. It was admitted by all

that without being reconciled to the Church their sins could not be forgiven. But how were they to be admitted to the Church? By (re)baptising them, replied S. Cyprian; by simply admitting them to penance, said S. Stephen. The question, therefore, be it observed, was not precisely about forgiveness of sins, much less about the forgiveness of original sin; it was about the most fitting way of admitting to Church-membership. But, it will be at once objected, S. Cyprian utterly denies the possibility of Church-membership except through (re)baptism. To this we answer, that S. Cyprian does not; and we quote the following passage from the epistle to Jubaianus:\* "But some will say, 'What then will become of those who in times past, coming to the Church from heresy, were admitted without (re)baptism?' The Lord is able of His mercy to grant pardon, and not to sever from the gifts of His Church those who, being *simply (simpliciter)* admitted to the Church, have in the Church fallen asleep." These words seem to furnish the explanation of the difficulty. S. Cyprian was ready to grant that "simple admission" to the Church might avail to Church-membership and remission; therefore he could, without betraying her Faith, admit liberty of action in others. His position, therefore, was this: he said to his opponents, "You do too much honour to heretical baptism by admitting that it is a sufficient baptism for the purposes of Church-membership. It was without profit when received." (So it was, to adults not in invincible ignorance. S. Cyprian did not know the truth which was developed later, that the sacraments, or at least some of them, when received by an unworthy subject, afterwards revive *remoto obice*.) "But," he would go on to say, "if any bishops do, as a fact, admit to Church-membership without (re)baptism, doubtless it *is* Church-membership, and will effect forgiveness of sins. Let each one do as his conscience bids him."

This view furnishes us with an explanation on one or two collateral points. We can easily conceive how S. Cyprian would call a bishop who should forbid re-baptism, an enemy to the Faith, and other hard names; because, in his opinion, this was to encourage heretics in the idea that their baptism—that is, their *sect-membership*—was admission to the true Church of Christ. We can see also how, in his opinion, the non-rebaptised were not necessarily or even probably excluded from the kingdom of heaven. We can see, lastly, how it was not necessary that their other sacraments, given or received, should be invalid; for they *are* made Church-members, though,

in S. Cyprian's opinion, they were not admitted in the best and only lawful way.

Objections may be urged against this view. But it appears impossible to maintain, as Monsig. Tizzani does, that the writer of the letters regards the question as of Catholic faith. The whole weight of Catholic authority is opposed to this, from S. Augustine downwards; and the anonymous French writer whose dissertation is given in Migne (*Patrologia Latina*, tom. iii.) quotes the words of no fewer than thirty-four theologians of name, all French, and before the middle of the eighteenth century, who expressly deny it. In replying to objections that may be urged from S. Cyprian's words, it should always be remembered that deductions from his argument, made either by himself or by others, are not to the point here. Whatever errors he may have committed, he never went so far astray as to suppose that what he or any other private bishop could argue out of Holy Scripture, was Catholic truth, in the sense that its contradictory was heresy.

From what has been said we may easily see that the dispute, taken as a whole, in no way demonstrates that S. Cyprian and the African bishops denied the Infallibility or the Supremacy of the Pope. S. Cyprian did not look on the question as one of Catholic faith, nor did S. Stephen mean to put forth a dogmatic decree.\* Leaving out of the question the often-repeated testimony of S. Cyprian himself to the headship of Peter and the pre-eminence of the Roman Church, one consideration may be said to settle the question. Neither S. Cyprian nor any of his councils ever repudiated the interference of S. Stephen, when, on other accounts, there appeared to be every reason to expect they would have done so; they said nothing more than that it was highly imprudent and hurtful.

We cannot, of course, enter here into the several objections of detail that are urged from S. Cyprian's writings on Baptism. The reader will find them answered in the Abbé Freppel's book; also in Billuart (*De Sacramentis*, diss. v.); or, perhaps, better still in Dr. Murray's treatise *De Ecclesia*

---

\* "Neque ab ipso Stephano fuerat dogmatico iudicio definita in iis ad Cyprianum litteris, in quibus nulla fuit proprie dicta definitio fidei, sed preceptum practicum, &c." *Ballerini, de Vi ac Ratione Primatus, R.P. Cap. xiii., § 3, 15.* It may be well to state, however, that some authorities maintain that the Pope, in this case, really put forth a dogmatic definition. The view taken in the text is not adopted because we think the decree mistaken in dogma or in fact; the contrary can be conclusively established.

(vol. iii., disp. xix.). All we intend to do is to remind the public of the state of the controversy.

In spite, however, of our conviction that Monsig. Tizzani has not performed the very difficult feat of erasing from ecclesiastical history a question which has been prominent there since the fifth century, it is impossible to help thinking that he is partially right. The difficulty is to see where the genuine ends and the forgery begins. Every critic, from Erasmus, his first editor, downward, acknowledges that S. Cyprian has been the victim of forgery. In S. Augustine's time, that is to say, when the Donatists first brought to light the materials which we have been considering, there were some, as he himself expressly tells us, who denied altogether that S. Cyprian's opinion had been such as the Donatists made out, and maintained that their account was a presumptuous and lying forgery. S. Augustine himself seems certainly inclined to think so too. With regard to two of their documents, the letter to Jubaianus and the third council of Carthage, he again, in other places, mentions his doubts. For himself, and with reference to his own controversy with the Donatists, he did not *deny* the authenticity of the materials they brought up, but went through and refuted them *seriatim*. But he certainly did not admit them, and the constant recurrence of such phrases as "*si tamen censuit*," "*si scripta ejus esse constat*," "*sicut vultis*," and the like, seems to leave no doubt about his own opinion, in spite of what M. Freppel says to the contrary. But where can we draw the line? Which of these letters is forged? It is not possible—perhaps it never will be possible—to say. But two remarks may be made which, we think, no honest and unprejudiced inquirer can dispute. The Donatists had two points to make good; first, to prove the necessity of sanctity in the minister for the valid administration of the sacraments; secondly, to discredit the authority of the Holy See. That it was not difficult to wrest S. Cyprian's authority to their own purposes on the first of these points, we are ready to admit; but is it not very probable that some of that arbitrary and apparently dishonest dealing with Scripture texts has come from some other source than what S. Augustine calls the "*pectus candidissimum*" of the martyr of Carthage? Much of the Cyprianic argument is Donatist all over, and, under the circumstances, it seems not unlikely that they themselves are the authors of it. But, in the next place, there is still more presumption that S. Cyprian did not say one-half of the hard things about S. Stephen that are attributed to him. First of all, it is extremely unlike all we know of the character and principles of S. Cyprian that he

should have abused any body, most especially a brother bishop. Monsig. Tizzani shows this excellently in a chapter on the "Christian maxims of S. Cyprian," and it may be noticed that the whole of antiquity is unanimous in ascribing to the holy bishop great meekness of temper, and sweetness of style. "Blessed Cyprian," says S. Jerome, "like a most pure fountain, floweth sweetly and softly."\* S. Augustine, speaking of the epistle to Jubaianus, tells us he could not sufficiently read and read over again "those peaceful strains;" and he has much more to the same effect.† Now it is quite impossible to apply these epithets to the epistle to Pompeius, which is the only one in which there is any proof that he is speaking of the Pope. All this becomes stronger when we consider what S. Cyprian has elsewhere said about peace and charity, about S. Paul's character of a bishop, about the primacy of S. Peter, and about the Roman See. These reflections are well put by Monsig. Tizzani in the chapter above cited, and in those on the character of S. Cyprian, and on his doctrine of the Church.

One effect this work of Monsig. Tizzani's ought to have. It ought to make Catholic writers of Church history look twice before they teach as undoubted truth such facts as the third Council of Carthage and the reception of Cyprian's legates by Pope S. Stephen. Readers ought to be told that the chronological and critical difficulties in this controversy make it at least uncertain whether many of the alleged events ever happened, or if they did, in what order they came. It will be evident that in the dispute on Baptism, the order of the facts is almost as important as the facts themselves; and there is no small uncertainty about both the one and the other.

---

\* Quoted in the Preface to the Oxford Translation.

† See Note to Oxford Translation, p. 258.

## ART. VII.—THE SECOND MAN VERIFIED IN HISTORY.

*Ecce Homo.* London & Cambridge : Macmillan & Co.

IN order to complete the view taken in the preceding paper\* of the work of Christ as the second Adam over against the work of the first Adam it is necessary to dwell at greater length upon a point of which only cursory mention was made therein. It was our object there to bring out the relation of Christ to the Church, but this cannot be done without fully exhibiting the relation to the same Church of the Holy Spirit. To the Incarnation the Fathers in general give the title of the Dispensation of the Son, and as the equivalent, the result, the complement and crown of this Dispensation, they put the Giving of the Spirit †. This Giving of the Spirit occupies the whole region of grace, and is coextensive with the whole action of the Incarnate God upon men whom He has taken to be his brethren. The Holy Spirit in this Giving is He who represents the Redeemer, and executes his will, not as an instrument, not as one subordinate, but as the very mind of Christ between whom and Christ there can far less enter any notion of division or separation than between a man and his own spirit. He is that other Paraclete, abiding for ever, who replaces to the disciples the visible absence of the first Paraclete, the Redeemer himself: He is the Power constituting the Kingdom of Christ; the Godhead inhabiting His Temple; the Soul animating His mystical Body; the Charity, kindling into a living flame the heart of His Bride; the Creator and Father of His Race.

This connection between the Dispensation of the Son and the Giving of the Spirit was delineated by our Lord Himself

\* This is a continuation of the paper entitled *The First and the Second Man*, in No. xviii.

† As S. Irenæus, 5. 20, omnibus unum et eundem Deum Patrem præcipientibus, et eandem dispositionem incarnationis Filii Dei credentibus, et eandem donationem Spiritus scientibus; and S. Aug. tom. 5, app. p. 307 f. *Ecce iterum humanis divina misceantur, id est, Vicarius Redemptoris: ut beneficia quæ Salvator Dominus inchoavit peculiari Spiritus Sancti virtute consummet, et quod ille redemit, iste sanctificet, quod ille acquisivit, iste custodiat.*—This striking sermon is quoted by Petavius as genuine, but placed by the Benedictines in the appendix.

when He first appeared to his assembled disciples after his resurrection. As they were gazing in wonder and trembling joy on that Body which had undergone his awful passion, as He shewed them the wounds in His hands and His feet, He told them how his sufferings were the fulfilment of all that in the law, the prophets, and the psalms had been written concerning Him. And thereupon it is said, He opened their mind to the understanding of these scriptures. It was thus that the Christ was to suffer, it was thus that He was to rise again on the third day. Hitherto He has dwelt upon His own dispensation, as the fulfilment of all prophecy, now He proceeds to its fruit: that in the name of this Christ repentance and remission of sins should be proclaimed to all nations beginning at Jerusalem. "And you," He says, "are the witnesses of these things. And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but stay you in the city of Jerusalem until you be endued with power from on high." Again, at another occasion of equal solemnity, when He was with his assembled disciples in visible form for the last time, at the moment preceding His ascension, He uses the same emphatic words, charging them not to depart from the city, but to await there that promise of the Father, the baptism in the Holy Ghost, which they were to receive in common together, which was to be the power in virtue of which they should be his witnesses for all time unto the ends of the earth: the power which instead of restoring a local kingdom to Israel, as was in their thoughts when they questioned him, was to create an universal kingdom to Him in the hearts of men. It is then as the result of His passion, and the token of His resurrection, that the Son sends down upon His disciples the promise of the Father, that is, the perpetual presence of the Spirit of the Father and the Son, the Spirit of Truth and Grace, that permanent and immanent power from on high, who, dwelling for ever in the disciples, makes the Church.

But these words, so singular and so forcible, which He uses on these two occasions, at His resurrection and His ascension, are themselves a reference to the long discourse which He had held with his apostles on the night of His passion. It is in this discourse, from the moment that Judas left them to the conclusion of the divine prayer—and if we can make any distinction in His words, surely these are the most solemn which were ever put together in human language, since they are the prayer not of a creature to the Creator, but the prayer of One divine Person to Another—it is in this discourse that He describes the power from on high with which, as the promise of the Father, He, the Son, would invest His disciples. It is here He says



that He would ask the Father, who should give them another Paraclete, the Spirit of truth, to abide with them for ever: whom the world would not receive, nor see, nor know, but whom they should know, because He should abide with them and be in them. This other Paraclete, coequal therefore with Himself, whom the Father should send in His name, and whom He should send from the Father, the Spirit of holiness as well as the Spirit of truth, should teach them all things and remind them of all His teaching. And His coming, though invisible, should profit them more than His own visible presence. For while He declared himself to be the Way, the Truth, and the Life, \* He revealed to them here that it was by that very way that the Spirit of truth should lead them by the hand into all truth. It was in this Truth, that is, in Himself, that they should be sanctified, and that they should be one, the glory of the Incarnation, which had been given to Him, passing on to them as the members of His Body, by the joint possession of the spirit of truth and holiness, whose presence was the gage that the Father loved them, as He loved Christ, the Body being identified with the Head. In all this He was describing to them the work of that other Paraclete, His own Spirit, "who was to sanctify what He had redeemed, and to guard and maintain possession of what He had acquired." † This is but a small portion of that abundant revelation, which our Lord then communicated to His apostles, concerning the Power from on high with which they were to be invested.

The words of our Lord to His apostles at the three great points of His passion, His resurrection, and His ascension, stand out beyond the rest in their appeal to our affections. The last words of a friend are the dearest, and these are the last words of the Bridegroom, and they are concerning His Bride. When He was Himself quitting His disciples He dwells upon the Power which was to create and maintain His Church, upon the gift of His Spirit, His other self, in which gift lay the formation of His kingdom. It is thus He expresses to us the point with which we started, that the Giving of His Spirit is the fulfilment of all that Dispensation wherein the eternal Word took human flesh.

---

\*) There is in the original words here something which is lost both in the Vulgate and in the English translation. First, c. xiv. 6: *ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ*; then c. xvi. 13, *ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκείνος τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ δὲ ἡ γῆ στεί ὑμᾶς εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν*. As Christ is the *ὁδὸς*, so His Spirit is the *ὁδὴγὼν*. Ego sum via et veritas; ille vos docebit omnem veritatem, does not render this: and as little, I am *the way*, the truth, and the life; He shall *lead* you into all truth.

† S. Aug., quoted above in note.

It is not only then the unanimous voice of the Fathers which sets the Giving of the Spirit over against the Incarnation of the Son. They are but carrying on that which our Lord so markedly taught; their tradition was but the echo of His voice, as their life was the fulfilment of it.

But it was a double malady in man which God the Word became man to cure. It was the whole nature which was affected with a taint, and the soul through the whole race touched in both its powers of the intellect\* and the will. That false worship which we have seen spreading through the earth, and that deep corruption of manners which was interlaced with it, were the symptoms of this malady. The perversion of the truth concerning the being of God, and all the duties of man which grow out of this being, was inextricably blended with the disregard of these duties in the actual conduct of man. It was in vain to set the truth before man's intellect without a corresponding power to act upon his will. Therefore the apostle described the glory of the only-begotten Son, when He dwelt as man among us, by the double expression that He was "full of grace and truth." Viewed as the Head of human nature, its Father and new beginning, He is the perpetual fountain to it of these two, which no law, not even one divinely given, could bestow. For the law could make nothing perfect, because it could not touch the will; and the law gave the shadow, but not the very truth of things. But when that unspeakable union of the divine nature with the human had taken effect in the unity of one Person, Truth and Grace had an everlasting human fountain in the created nature of the Incarnate Word. Now was the fountain to pour forth a perpetual stream upon the race assumed. And this it does by the descent of the Spirit. In this descent upon the assembled Church the Grace and Truth of the divine Head, with which His Flesh, carried by the Godhead, overstreams, find themselves a human dwelling in the race. Such an operation belongs only to the Divine Spirit, for God alone can so act upon the intellect and will of creatures as to penetrate them with His gifts of Truth and Grace, while He leaves them their free will, their full individuality, as creatures. This, then, was the range of that power with which our Lord foretold to His apostles that they should be invested, and for which He bade them wait. The whole field of truth, as it respects the relation of God to His creatures as moral beings, and the whole extent of grace, as it touches the human will, for the performance of every act which a reasonable creature can execute, made up the extent of

---

\* This word is used as the equivalent of *λογος*, ratio, Vernunft, in man.

that divine indwelling in men which the Spirit of Christ assumed upon the day of Pentecost. This was the power of the Holy Ghost which then came down upon men. Through the whole divine discourse which preceded His passion, our Lord dwells upon this double power, referring to Himself, as the Truth, to His Spirit, as the Spirit of the Truth, to Himself as the Vine, and so that root of grace which should communicate its sap to the branches, and to His Spirit, who should take of His, and give it to them; uniting both ideas of Truth and Grace in that one word, Sanctify them in thy Truth, that is, by incorporation with me, who am the Truth, in my Spirit, who is the Truth. And so the eternal Word, having assumed a human Body, when He withdraws His corporal presence, proceeds to form that other human Body, the dwelling-place of His Spirit, in which His Truth and Grace are to become visible.

Thus the transfusion of Truth and Grace from the Incarnate Word to His mystical Body is the generic character of the giving of the Spirit.

Two differential marks distinguish this giving from any which preceded the coming of our Lord.

First, the Spirit should come upon them, but should never depart from them. "He shall give you another Comforter, to abide with you for ever, the Spirit of Truth." This giving was not an intermittent operation, whether extraordinary, such as had shown itself in Moses and the Prophets, for their inspiration in writing, or their guidance in particular trials, nor that ordinary one whereby from the beginning He had enabled all the good and just to lead a life acceptable to Him. It was a far higher gift,\* wherein, as S. Augustine says, by the very presence of His majesty no longer the mere odour of the balsam, but the substance itself of the sacred unguent, was poured into those vessels, making them His temple, and conveying that adoption in virtue of which they should not be left orphans, but have their Father invisibly with them for ever. No intermittent operation, and no presence less than that of His substance, would reach the force of the words used by our Lord, "I will ask the Father, and He shall send you another Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, to abide with you for ever;" for that word "other" conveys a comparison with Himself, from whom they had never been separated since He had called them, in whose continuance with them alone was their strength,

---

\* See Petavius de Trin., vii., 7, where he states it to be the general belief of the ancient writers that a new and *substantial* presence of the Holy Ghost began at the day of Pentecost.

their unity, their joint existence, and mission, without whom they could do nothing. All this to them that "other" Paraclete was to be, in order that the departure of the former Paraclete should be expedient for them. For in this continuity of His presence was involved the further gift that the Paraclete was to come to them as a Body, and because of this manner of coming He replaced the Former. Had He come to them only as individuals they would have suffered a grievous loss, the loss of the Head who made them one. But He came to them as the Body of Christ, and by coming made them that Body, being the Spirit of the Head. That rushing, mighty wind filled the whole house in which they were sitting, and they all were filled together with the presence; and as a sign that the old confusion and separation of mankind were in them to be done away, speaking in one tongue the one truth which was ever more to dwell with them, they were heard in all the various languages of the nations present at the feast. "The society by which men are made the one Body of the only Son of God belongs to the Spirit," \* and He came upon all together in one House to indicate, as He made, that one Body. "The mode of giving," says S. Augustine, "was such as never before appeared. No where do we read before that men congregated together had by receiving the Holy Ghost spoken with the tongues of all nations." † "Therefore He came upon Pentecost as upon His birthday." ‡

It is His presence alone which confers four gifts upon the body which He vivifies.

It was the will, says S. Augustine, § of the Father and the Son that we should have communion with each other and with Them by means of that which is common to Them, and by that gift to collect us into one, which, being one, They both have; that is to say, by the Holy Ghost, who is God, and the gift of God. For, says S. Thomas, || the unity of the Holy Spirit makes unity in the Church. It is not by similarity, or by juxta-position, or by agreement, how much less by concessions and compromises, that unity exists in the body of Christ, but because the Spirit is one, because all gifts, however various, all functions, however distinct, are distributed by this One.

For the same reason truth dwells in this Body, because He is the Spirit of Truth. Our Lord Himself has defined His

\* S. Aug., *Tom. v.*, 398, g.

† *Ib. Tom. v.*, 47.

|| S. Thomas in *Joh. i. lec. 10*: "Nam unitas Spiritus Sancti facit in Ecclesia unitatem."

† *Ib. Tom. iii.*, p. 2, p. 527.

§ *Ib. Tom. v.*, 392. e.

great function in this particular, to lead His disciples by the hand\* into all truth, to teach all things, and remind of all things which made up His own teaching. This function began on the day of Pentecost, and lasts to the day of judgment, and belongs to the Body of Christ, and to it alone, and belongs to it because it is animated by the Spirit of Truth. And this animation is like the Head, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. It is not of any past time, more or less, than of the present or the future. It is the illumination which belongs to that whole last day, through which the Body of Christ grows, teaches, labours, and suffers, until the mortal day break into the light of eternity.

His third gift to the Body is that of charity, and for the same reason, because He is this Himself. He who is not only the Unity of the Father and the Son, but their mutual Love, coming as the gift of that Divine love which redeemed the world by the sacrifice of its Maker, and as the Spirit of that Love, who invested Himself with human flesh, creates in this human dwelling-place that one charity which bears His name, and is of His nature, and which in that one body joins the wills of men together as His Truth joins their intellects. If the Body of Christ has one prevailing charity, which reaches to all its members, and encompasses the least as well as the greatest, it is because the heart is divine.

The fourth gift which He bestows upon the Body is sanctification, and it may be said to be the result of the other three. This, again, is His own name, and nature, and many have thought and said, His personal attribute, to make holy; and that, as Fatherhood indicates the first Person, and Sonship the second, so the making holy names the third, the bond of the most blessed Trinity. But this, at least, may be said to be the final cause of the body which He animates, the imparting of holiness. In virtue of this gift, all the means and aids and rules of holiness are stored up in the Body. And this does not mean that there is not a continual falling away from the rule and practice of holiness in particular members, but it means that while these, in spite of the Body's nurture and solicitude, fall away from it and perish, the Body lasts for ever, the rules and aids and means of holiness lasting for ever within it, because it is the Body of the Spirit of holiness.

Now these four gifts, Unity, Verity, Charity, and Sanctity, can none of them exist in the Body without the other, and all of them exist together there, because they have one divine root, that indwelling of the Holy Spirit which is the fruit of

---

\* ὁδηγεῖν.

the Incarnation, and whereby the mystical Body of Christ corresponds to his natural Body. Of this Body the beginning is Unity, the substance Truth, the bond Charity, the end sanctity. Countless heresies and schisms have sought to break up the coinherence of these gifts, but in vain. The only success which the indwelling Spirit allows them is to detach from the Body those who are unworthy to remain in it, and to prolong for a time their maimed existence by some portion of some of his gifts. Truth, for instance, has such a vitality that many a heresy will live for ages on that fragment which it has detached from the mass; unity and charity have such force that even their shadow, that is, the joint possession of a fragmentary truth, and the good will thence proceeding, will prolong for a time a sort of corporate existence. Holiness has so attractive a power, that zeal and self-denial, which present the seeming of it, will make the fortune of a sect for a time. But in the union and the completeness of these four gifts, the great Body of Christ stands out through all the ages inimitable and unapproachable. Alone, it dares to claim them thus united and complete, for alone it can present their realization.

These four gifts, then, dwell in the Body in a higher degree than that in which they adorn the members of the Body, as in it, by force of the Spirit's indwelling, they ever exist together. Let us now see the qualities which the Spirit imparts to the members of the Body, by virtue of their incorporation into it.

First of all is the forgiveness of sins. The Spirit takes them out of that state of alienation in which they are born, and unites them to His Body, and in so doing He effaces both the birth-sin and every actual sin which they may have committed. This is that plenary forgiveness of sins, the pure gift of God unpreceded by any merit on man's part, which greets the new-comer out of Adam's body of sin into the Body of Christ. It is imparted by and from the Body, and to its members alone.

The second quality is that illumination of the mind, irradiated by the truth, the whole compass of which exists in the Body. This illumination is the root of the virtue of faith, by means of which the individual mind appropriates the divine truth presented to it. The force of the virtue differs in the individual as the keenness of sight in the natural man, but the visual power is the same in quality in all. By it the mind of the believer lays hold in ever varying degree, one more and one less, of that great harmony of truth which is held in its completeness, its manifold applications, and all but infinite



relations only by the Body. For the truth of which we deal is not unlocalized and scattered, the prey, as it were, of the individual mind, which can hunt it down and take it as a spoil, but it is a divine gift, orb'd in the sphere which was created for it, the Body of that Word who is the Truth. Hence the first question to the applicant for baptism: What askest thou of the Church of God? and the answer is, Faith.

The third quality is the adoption of Sonship, which flows directly from incorporation into the Body of Christ, and to which man has no sort of title in himself or from his own nature, but which comes to him only by kindred with Him who, on the morning of His resurrection, greeted that great penitent who bore the figure of the Church with that paschal salutation of the Second Adam, "Go to my brethren and say, I ascend to my Father and to your Father, to my God and to your God." And the divine virtue of hope well corresponds to this quality, the effects of which in a state of trial and conflict are to so great a degree future and unseen. It seems, moreover, to be as a special link and tie between the virtue which purifies the intellect, and that which corrects the will and makes it obedient. Thus through it we pass on to the fourth quality of Sanctification, which is the completion of the other three and their end, the harmony of each individual will with the Divine will, the work of charity. That divine virtue is the special fruit of the passion of Christ, which was to gather up into one what sin had disunited and torn away, first from its Author, and then from the order by Him created, which was to heal the animosities thus introduced, and to change the world from a conflict wherein each sought to better himself at the expense of his neighbour, into a community cemented together with mutual affection. It was with reason, therefore, that S. Augustine would not allow the possession of charity, save in the unity of that one Body which Christ had created,\* and without charity there is no sanctification.

The four qualities thus slightly sketched, forgiveness of sins, illumination of faith, adoption to sonship, and sanctification by charity, which come to the individual by and with incorporation into the Body, are not given to him irrevocably, but are

---

\* Epist. 185. Tom. 2, p. 663. *Proinde Ecclesia Catholica sola corpus est Christi, cujus ille caput est Salvator corporis sui. Extra hoc corpus neminem vivificat Spiritus Sanctus, quia sicut ipse dicit Apostolus, Caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per Spiritum-sanctum qui datus est nobis. Non est autem particeps divine caritatis, qui hostis est unitatis. Non habent itaque Spiritum Sanctum qui sunt extra Ecclesiam.*



conditional upon his perseverance. They are portions and derivations of that vast treasure of Truth and Grace which the Body holds in their entirety and for ever, because of the perpetual indwelling of the Spirit who makes its life, but which He dispenses as it pleases Him to the members, and which He may withdraw from them in default of their co-operation. Vast are the losses thereby incurred, not to the treasure-house which remains inexhaustible, but to those who fall out of it, back into the world, or, rather, that body of Adam from which they were taken. But these losses touch not the beauty and the glory of that Body of Christ, which goes on through the ages, and takes up its own, fulfils its appointed work, and reaches its intended end.

Thus on the day of Pentecost a new Power, the Spirit of the Incarnate God, descended not upon single men, but upon an assembly of men, binding it in a unity, conveying to it a truth, kindling in it a charity, and working through these a sanctification never before known: which Power, thenceforth dwelling in that Body, was to collect and draw into itself out of all nations and ranks of men those who should form the Church, that is, the Kingdom and Temple, and House, and Body, and Family of Christ. In it was to work and from it to go forth henceforward to all time the virtue of Him who had assumed our flesh, not transiently, but for ever; in the Head and the Body, through the life of His Spirit, Christ should teach and bear for ever that witness to the truth of which He spoke in the hall of Pilate, and concerning which He said that "this gospel of the kingdom should be proclaimed through the whole world, for a witness to all nations, and then that the end should come."\* To the continuance, the indissolubility, the purity of this power He has pledged His word in such a way that they who deny it must in doing so deny Him. He has even made the unity of this Body the special mark to men of the truth of His mission, beseeching His Father in that last prayer, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for those also who through their word shall believe in Me, that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me."

There are three analogies † which illustrate this creation of

---

\* Matt. xxiv. 14.

† See Möhler: *Die Einheit in der Kirche*, p. 176. Der Körper des Menschen ist eine Offenbarung des Geistes, der in ihm sein Dasein bekundet, und sich entwickelt. Der Staat ist eine nothwendige Erscheinung, eine Bildung und Gestaltung des von Gott gegebenen *κοινωνικόν*.

our Lord—a creation in itself as singular as His assumption of man's nature.

First, that of the relation between the soul and body. The soul is the life of the body; the body, as it were, the mansion and home of the soul, its bearer. Through the body the qualities of the soul become visible and known; its powers exercise themselves, and personal unity so binds the two together that we love or hate, admire or despise, the one for the sake of the other: the grief of the soul acts upon the body, the sickness of the body depresses the soul. Through the acts of the body we learn the very existence of the soul, and in these acts it portrays itself. Human nature has been so made by its Creator that the qualities of soul and body, of spirit and matter, are imputed in the individual man to each other. Now to the Body we have been considering the Spirit of Christ is, as it were, the soul. It is nothing strange, then, if it was His will to create such a Body, if it be the result of His Incarnation, that the like effects which exist in the case of every human soul and body should take place here. To this Body also the power and virtue of its soul are communicated; and, since Christ by His Spirit animates it, in honouring it He is honoured; in despising it, He is despised. There is an imparting to it of the qualities which He has, and thus it is that unity and sanctity, truth and charity dwell in it as the operation of His mind. Thus every man contains in himself, in the union of soul and body, an image of that tie by which Christ and His Church are one.

Secondly, because God has created man for society, He has implanted in him an irrepressible instinct of communion with his brother-men. This instinct it is which, under circumstances of every possible variety, results in one end, the State. The human commonwealth, whatever external shape it wear, whatever division of its powers it make, springs from this. In virtue of this original formation of man, that he is made to live together, and gregariously, not separately, the supreme power of government, the power of life and death, dwells in the community, and obedience to it has a divine sanction. Thus, the commonwealth has a variety of powers which the individual has not, and not only so, but it also has powers which do not arise from the mere aggregation of individuals, rather which belong to it as a community, as a whole, for instance sovereignty in all the details of its exercise. But now the very object for which Christ became Incarnate was to constitute a divine commonwealth. He is the King: it is the tenderness of a God Incarnate that He calls and makes His Kingdom His Body. The powers, then, which belong to the earthly

commonwealth, belong with the changes which the change of subject carries, to the Divine. They who have so great a reverence for human government, who respect in the nation an ultimate irresponsible power, ought, if they were consistent, when they acknowledge Christ as having come in the flesh, to acknowledge His government in the kingdom which He has set up. All that his country is to the patriot, the Church is to the Christian, but in so much higher a degree, as the object for which Christ came is above the needs and cares of this present life. Has the City of God, then, less claim upon Christians than the city of Romulus had upon Romans? Thus, in the natural duty of the citizen, as well as in the compound nature of man, is contained a reminder of the Christian's relation to the Church, and a picture and ensample of the Church's authority.

Thirdly, there is the analogy presented by the transmission of natural life \* through the one flesh of Adam to all his race. As the breath of natural life, once given to Adam, is continued on to all those sprung from his body, the power of the Creator never starting anew, but working in and through the trunk of human nature; so the supernatural life springing from our Lord, as the gift of His Incarnation, is breathed on the day of Pentecost into the whole Body of the Church to be communicated from that Body for ever. Christ is to the one exactly what Adam is to the other. As the Word of God, creating, joined to the inheritance of the flesh of Adam from generation to generation the communication of a spirit such as Adam's, by which double action we have the unity of race, so the Word of God, redeeming, when He had taken our flesh as the first fruits of human nature, breathed forth from that flesh the communication of His Spirit to the Body of the Church, by which we belong to the race of the Incarnate God, and are become His family, and make His house. Thus that which the body of Adam is naturally, the Body of Christ is spiritually, and the descent of human nature in its unity a picture of the Holy Spirit's unity working through the Body which He has chosen. And this analogy is made the more striking by the statement so often repeated in the Greek Fathers, that with the natural life, as first given to Adam, was conjoined the gift of the Holy Ghost, forfeited

---

\* Möhler: *Einheit*, &c., p. 8. Wie das Leben des sinnlichen Menschen nur einmal unmittelbar aus der Hand des Schöpfers kam, und wo nun sinnliches Leben werden soll, es durch die Mittheilung der Lebenskraft eines schon Lebenden bedingt ist, so sollte das neue göttliche Leben ein Ausströmen aus den schon Belebten, die Erzeugung desselben sollte eine Ueberzeugung sein.

afterwards by his sin, and withdrawn from him and his race, and now restored as the special gift of the Incarnate God.\* Thus the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost is a true and real counterpart of the creation of man in Eden; but they who share it are become kindred of God through His flesh, and by so sharing it together, they form that society which failed through Adam's sin. In the first creation the Omnipotent Creator, in His bounty towards His favourite child, as foreseeing the assumption of that nature by Himself, attached to the gift of natural life the Spirit of sanctification; in the second, having assumed that nature, He gave through His own Body, first taken out of us, then crucified, now risen and exalted, the gift of the Spirit, Who, with all the endowments springing from Him, as the Inspirer of truth and charity, of unity and holiness, dwells in that Body for ever.

Thus in the union of the soul and body, in the constitution and authority of the human commonwealth, and in the race's natural unity, God holds before us three analogies, which each in some respect, and altogether very largely, illustrate His finished work, to which all natural productions of His providence are subordinate, His work of predilection, His work of unbounded love and sovereign magnificence, the creation of that which is at once the Body, the Kingdom, and the Family of the Incarnate Word.

From all that has gone before we gather this conclusion, that to become a Christian was to enter into a spiritual and physical † unity with Christ by incorporation into that Body which He had created as the result of His becoming man. This it was for the individual to become a Christian. But Christianity itself was neither a mere system of belief, nor an outward order representing that belief, but "the great and glorious Body of Christ," ‡ possessing and exhibiting the

\* For instance, two passages on the Incarnation in S. Cyril of Alexandria, tom. iv., pp. 819-824 and 918-920, set forth the whole sequence of the Fall and the Restoration, and how wonderfully the gift of the Spirit replaces what was lost in Adam.

† See S. Cyril Alex. in Joan, p. 997, e. *ἐν δὲ τούτοις ἤδη πως καὶ φυσικὴν τὴν ἐνότητά διεικνύει σπονδάζομεν, καθ' ἣν ἡμεῖς τε ἀλλήλοις καὶ οἱ πάντες Θεῷ συνδοόμεθα* κ.τ.λ. and p. 998, *τις γὰρ ἂν καὶ εἰλοί καὶ τῆς ἐς ἀλλήλους φυσικῆς ἐνώσεως ἐξουκίει τοὺς εἰ ἐνὸς τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος πρὸς ἐνότητα τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν ἀναθεσμονούμενος;*

‡ S. Irene. 4, c. 23, 7. *ἀνακρινεῖ τοὺς τὰ σχίσματα ἐργαζομένους, κένους ὄντας τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγάπης, καὶ τὸ ἴδιον λυσitelὲς σκοποῦντας, ἀλλὰ μὴ τὴν ἑνωσιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας; καὶ διὰ μικρὰς καὶ τὰς ὑψόσας αἰτίας τὸ μέγα καὶ ἐνδοξον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ τέμνοντας καὶ διαιροῦντας, καὶ ὅσον τὸ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἀναιροῦντας. τοὺς ἐρήνην λαλοῦντας καὶ πόλεμον ἐργαζομένους, ἀληθῶς διωλίζοντας τὸν κώνωπα, καὶ τὸν κάμηλον καταπίνοντας.*

whole truth of doctrine, possessing and distributing all the means of grace, and presenting together to God those whom it had reconciled with Him, and made one, as the members of the Son by the indwelling of the Spirit.

Let us now trace the exact correspondence of the historical fact with the dogmatic statement just given.

The acts of the Apostles exhibit to us the creation of the divine society by the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. When they were all together the sound as of a rushing mighty wind was heard, which filled the whole house wherein they were sitting, and tongues as of fire were seen, the tongues apportioned severally, but the fire one,\* which rested upon each, to kindle in all that eternal flame of charity which was to draw into one the hearts of men, the fire of which our Lord had spoken as being that which He was come to light upon the earth. Fire, whose inward nature it is at once to illuminate and warm, to purify and unite, was thus appropriately selected as the outward sign, both expressing and conveying the fourfold office of the Comforter, who came to be "no longer an occasional visitant, but a perpetual Consoler and eternal Inhabitant"† of this his chosen home. As each in that assembly spoke in the one tongue of the country, he was heard by those present in the several tongues of all the nations of the earth represented at that great feast by the Jews who dwelt in them. And this was the mark, says S. Augustine, ‡ of the Church which was to be through all nations, and that no one should receive the Holy Spirit, save he who should be jointed into the framework of its unity; the mark which signified that the confusion of Babel, dividing the race into nationalities jealous of each other and perpetual enemies, was to be reversed and overcome by the one Power whose force to unite should be greater than the force of sin to sever; who should gather out of all nations the City of God, fed by the exulting and abounding river of His Spirit, the

\* Acts ii. 3, ὥφθησαν αὐτοῖς διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὥστε πυρὸς, ἐκάθειτέ τε ἐφ' ἑνα ἕκαστον αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν ἅπαντες Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.

† Non jam visitator subitus, sed perpetuus consolator et habitator æternus. S. Aug., Tom. 5 d. app., p. 307.

‡ Con. Crescou., Lib. ii., c. 14, Tom. ix., p. 418. Hic Spiritus sanctus veniens in eos tale signum primitus dedit, ut qui eum acciperent linguis omnium grutum loquerentur, quia portendebat Ecclesiam per omnes gentes futuram, nec quemquam accepturum Spiritum sanctum nisi qui ejus unitati copularetur. Hujus fontis largo atque invisibili flumine lætificat Deus civitatem suam, quia Propheta dixit, Fluminis impetus lætificat civitatem Dei. Ad hunc enim fontem nullus extraneus, quia nullus nisi vita æterna dignus accedit. Hic est proprius Ecclesiæ Christi.

fountain proper and peculiar to the Church of Christ: the mark of that one truth,\* which conveys and harmonizes and works out into all its details the whole revelation of God, and so is the utterance of one voice, the voice of Christ; speaking to all nations, not in the broken languages of their division, but in the Unity of His Person, carried by His Body. We have then in the one Fire the one inward power; in the one language its outward expression, in the assembly its receptacle, the House of God. This Body appears at once as formed and complete. In it sits and prays in her silent tenderness and unapproachable grandeur, as the Mother of the risen Lord and Head, and the Mother too of His race, the most beloved, the most

---

\* Ἡ ἀλήθεια; there seems to be no one word in the New Testament of more pregnant signification than this, which in a great number of instances bears the sense of *the whole body of the divine revelation*. The root of this meaning would seem to lie in Christ Himself who as the Divine Word is the *ἀντολογία*, the *εἰκών* of the Father, on which title S. Athanasius and S. Cyril of Alexandria specially dwell, while S. Hilary expresses the Blessed Trinity, by *æternitas in Patre, Species in Imagine, Usus in Munere*, on which see S. Augustine's magnificent comment, *de Trin.*, l. vi. 10, p. 850; and as our Lord is from eternity the Truth, so in and by His Incarnation He becomes in a special sense the Truth to man: *ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ*; and so the Spirit who proceeds from the Father and the Son, *ille ineffabilis quidam complexus Patris et Imaginis* (S. Aug.), is *τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας*, who *ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν*; and again 1 John v. 6: *τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ μαρτυροῦν, ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια*. This is the first meaning. Secondly, as derived from it, the Truth is the whole body of the divine revelation. In this sense it is used in a great many places of St. John's Gospel, and the Apostolic Epistles, e.g., John i. 14, 17; viii. 31; xvi. 13; xvii. 17; xviii. 37; 1 John ii. 21; iii. 19; 2 John i. 1-3; 3 John 3, 4, 8, 12; 1 Tim. iii. 15, where because this whole body of truth dwells in the Church of Christ, and there alone, it is emphatically called the House of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the Truth: 1 Tim. ii. 3; Rom. xv. 8; 2 Cor. iv. 2; xiii. 8; Gal. iii. 1; v. 7; Ephes. i. 13; iv. 21-24 (in which passage the Apostle contrasts heathen man with Christian, the one, *τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης*; the other, *τὸν κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας*, and again, the mass of the Gentiles, as *τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοῦς αὐτῶν, ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ*, while Christians *ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε, καθὼς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ*); 2 Thess. ii. 8-13; 1 Tim. iv. 3; vi. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 15, 25; iii. 7, 8; iv. 4; Titus i. 1 and 14; Heb. x. 26; Jac. v. 19; 1 Pet. i. 22; 2 Pet. ii. 2. In this second sense, as signifying the whole body of the divine revelation, the expression has been searched for, but without success, in the Gospels of S. Matthew, S. Mark, and S. Luke, and in the Acts.

Thirdly, as the effect of this revelation to man, the Truth signifies uprightness, as equivalent to justice or sanctity, in the individual.

Fourthly, it means sincerity, absence of hypocrisy, and

Fifthly, correspondence to fact.

In the Apocalypse our Lord is designated "the holy, the true," "the Amen, the witness faithful and true," the rider of the white horse, "called faithful and true," "whose name is the Word of God."—iii. 7, 14; xix. 11.

loveable, and the most loving of creatures,\* whose great function in the Church for ever is to pray for the members of her Son, and to solicit the graces of His Spirit, which as the Mother of the sacred race she gains and distributes to all and each that belong to it, a Second Eve who corresponds to the Second Adam, as the First Eve in the divine plan corresponded to the First Adam. In it the Apostles, so long before chosen and designated by their Lord, and having already received from Him portions of their supernatural power on the day of His resurrection and during the forty days of His secret instruction, teach and govern; in it Peter at their head exercises that primacy, which, imaged out by a new name imposed at his first calling, promised at his great confession, and confirmed and conveyed on the sea shore of the lake of Galilee, is exhibited with such grandeur, as He stood with the eleven and lifted up His voice, to describe to the men of Judea and the inhabitants of Jerusalem the nature of the event which they were witnessing, and the fulfilment of all the promises made through their prophets concerning that presence of God in the pouring out of His Spirit among men in the last days. That first discourse of His at the head of His brethren is the summary as it were of His perpetual office of teaching, concerning the dispensation of the Christ in the midst of the Church. Its immediate effect was the aggregation of three thousand persons to the Body, who were told that this was the way in which they should receive remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost.† The subsequent teaching of Peter and the Apostles, accompanied with miraculous cures, produced further aggregations among all ranks of the people. And the mode of salvation for all time is pointedly marked out by the words, "the Lord was adding to the Church day by day such as should be saved."

We have only to repeat the process which is thus described as having taken place at Jerusalem in the first months after the day of Pentecost, by carrying it through the various cities of the Roman empire, Damascus, Antioch, Rome, Alexandria, and between these all round the shores of the Mediterranean, to have a just picture of the mode in which the Divine Society grew and gathered into itself more and more of those who listened to the truth which it announced. What is important to dwell upon is that men uniformly became Christians in one way, by being received into the Divine Body, through which reception forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost were con-

---

\* La creatura, la più amabile, la più amata, e la più amante di Dio.  
—S. Alfonso, *Gran mezzo della preghiera*, p. 280.

† Acts ii. 38.



veyed to them. From the whole account contained in the sacred Scriptures, and from all that remains to us of history, the great fact is established for us that Christianity came into the world at its first beginning a society created by the Holy Ghost, and held together and informed by Him as its soul, Who is sent down upon it as the Promise of the Father from the Incarnate Son.

Further it was in and by their reception into this society that men received all the fruits of the Incarnation ; it was in it that all the gifts of the Holy Ghost dwelt, and through it that they were dispensed. By hearing the truth announced by its ministry, penitence was engendered in the listeners, itself a preventing grace of the Holy Ghost, which gave inward effect to the outward word. As a working of this penitence they came, according to the instruction of the teachers, to be baptized. By and in the act of baptism they were received into the divine society, and made partakers of the full operation of the Spirit who dwelt in it. They had the divine virtues of faith, hope, and charity infused into them, each according to the measure of the grace accorded to him, and to help the exercise of these virtues, that they might be borne as it were with the wings of a Spirit, the seven-fold gifts of wisdom, understanding, counsel, fortitude, knowledge, piety, and fear, were added to the soul. None of these virtues and gifts were possessed by believers as individuals : all of them came to men as members of her who was dowered with the blood of Christ,\* and whose bridal quality imparted to her children all which that blood had purchased. In her was stored up that great, inexhaustible source of abiding life, the Body and Blood of her Lord and Husband : in her the redeeming Word gave direct from His heart the vivifying stream. In her was the gift of teaching which illumined the understanding, and not only drew from without, as we have seen, those who should be saved from the ignorance of the pagan or the carnalism of the Jew, but which erected in the world the Chair of Truth,† the rule and standard of right belief, that is, which was the continuance of the pentecostal gift, the illuminating and kindling

---

\* Non te fefellit sponsus tuus : non te fefellit qui suo sanguine te dotavit. S. Aug., Tom. v., 1,090 b.

† Quod tunc faciebat unus homo accepto Spiritu sancto, ut unus homo linguis omnium loqueretur, hoc modo ipsa unitas facit, linguis omnibus loquitur. Et modo unus homo in omnibus gentibus linguis omnibus loquitur, unus homo, caput et corpus, unus homo, Christus et Ecclesia, vir perfectus, ille sponsus, illa sponsa. Sed erunt, inquit, duo in carne una ; iudicia Dei vera, justificata in idipsum : propter unitatem. S. Aug., in Ps. xviii. 2. Tom. iv., 85 f.

fire, and the speaking tongue of unity, which the Body of Christ possesses for ever. It was by enjoying these endowments together in her bosom, by the actions of a life pervaded with these principles, by the joint possession and exercise of these supernatural powers which at once opened to the intellect a new field of knowledge and strengthened the will to acts above its inborn force, that men were Christians. And those who remembered what they had been as Jews, and what they had been as heathens, had no difficulty in recognizing such a life as the effect of a divine grace, and no temptation to refer it to anything which belonged to them as individuals, since its commencement coincided with their entrance into a divine society, its growth depended on their membership in that Body. Their union with Christ in this Body was something direct and palpable; to them the several degrees of that one ministry constituted by Christ, were the joints and articulations of the structure; the teaching thence proceeding as it were the current of life; by their being parts of the structure they were saved from the confusion of errors which swept freely round them without, through the craft of men and the seduction of deceit.\* "Possessing the truth in charity," or "sanctified in the truth" was the expression of that divine life in common, whereby they were to grow up into one, and be called by the name of their Lord,† because inseparably united to him by the nerves and ligaments of one Body.

And this makes manifest to us how Christians, while scattered through every city of the great Roman empire, formed one Body. It was by virtue of the unity of spiritual jurisdiction which directed the whole ministry of that Body. The command of our Lord was, "Go, and make disciples all nations," "proclaim the gospel to every creature;" the Body assembled and empowered at Pentecost was to carry out this command. How did it do so? The teaching and ruling power was distributed through a ministry wherein those of a particular order were equal as holding that order: bishops as bishops were equal, priests as priests. But not the less by the distribution of the places where the ministry was to be fulfilled, subordination was maintained through the whole Body. Had it been otherwise, as each Bishop had the completeness of the priesthood in himself, his sphere of action, that is, his diocese, would have constituted a distinct body. But no such thing was ever imagined in the Church of those first centuries.

\* Ephes. iv., 11-16. ἀληθινοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ.—Joh. xvii. 19. ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.

† 1 Cor. xii. 12, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστός.

The Bishops were, on the contrary, joint possessors of one power, only to be exercised in unity.\* The unity was provided for in the Apostolic body by the creation of the Primacy, without which the Body never acted, the Primate being made before the Body—the Primate on the sea-shore of the lake before the ascension; the Body on the day of Pentecost. Spiritual jurisdiction being nothing else but the grant to exercise all spiritual powers, two jurisdictions would make two bodies; a thousand would make a thousand; so that the more the Church grew, the more it would be divided, were it not that the root of all its powers in their exercise is one. A spiritual kingdom is absolutely impossible without this unity of jurisdiction; and in virtue of it the whole Church, from north to south and from east to west, was and is one Body in its teaching and its rule; that is, in the administration of all those gifts which were bestowed at the day of Pentecost, and which have never ceased to be exercised from that day to this, and which shall never cease to the end of the world. Thus as it is through the Body that men are made and kept Christians, so the Primacy is that principle of cohesion and subordination without which the Body cannot exist.

Let us carry on the history of the divine Body to another point. How was the Truth transmitted in it?

Peter and his brethren having received through the great forty days from our Lord the complement of His teaching concerning His kingdom, were empowered by the descent of the Holy Ghost to commence its propagation. And for this work they use the same instrument which their Lord had used—the living spoken word. They labour together for some time; after several years they divide the world between them; but in both these periods they found communities and supply them with everything needful for complete organization and future increase and progress by their spoken teaching, which therefore contained the whole deposit of the truth. The gospel of which S. Paul so repeatedly speaks was that which he communicated by word of mouth, and S. Peter and all the rest did the same. Communities were planted by Apostolic zeal over a great part of the Roman empire before as yet anything was written by their founders. The whole administration of the sacraments, and the order and matter of the divine service, were arranged by this personal teaching of the living word. All that concerned the Person of our Lord, all

---

\* So says the great maintainer of Episcopal power, S. Cyprian, in his famous aphorism: *Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur.*

that He had taught, done, and suffered, was so communicated. One reason of this is plain. It was not the bare gospel, but the "gospel of the kingdom," \* which was to be proclaimed to all nations. It was not a naked intellectual truth of which they were the bearers, but a kingdom which they were to build. They were not disseminating a sect of philosophy, but founding an empire. They were a King's heralds, and every king has a realm. Thus the Kingdom of the Word was proclaimed by the word spoken through many voices, but as the outpouring of one Spirit given on the day of Pentecost. This whole body of their teaching, therefore, was one Tradition; that is, a delivery over of the truth to them by inspiration of the Spirit, as the Truth who had become incarnate taught it, and a delivery of this truth from them to the communities which they set up. The first communication of the Christian faith to the individual was never made by writing. How, said the Apostle, should they invoke one whom they did not believe, but how believe in one of whom they had not heard, and how hear without a preacher, and how preach except they were sent? † It did not occur to him to ask how should they believe in one of whom they had not read. On the contrary, he gives in these few words the whole order of the truth's transmission. He conceived not heralds without a commission, any more than faith without trust in the word of the heralds. But here is the great sending, at and from the day of Pentecost, the root of perpetual mission from which the heralds derive their commission; they are sent, they proclaim, they are heard, they are believed, and this faith opens the door for the admission of subjects into the kingdom, according to the law which they proclaim. Thus are described to us at some length the acts of that wise master-builder whose words we have just cited, but though he laboured more abundantly than all, all acted after the same manner. The Church was founded by personal teaching, of which the living word was the instrument, and the whole truth which was thus communicated was termed the Tradition ‡ or Delivery.

We now come to the second step. Before the Apostles were taken to their reward, the same Spirit, who had instructed them that they were to found the spiritual kingdom by means of the living word, inspired them to commit to writing a portion of that great tradition which they had

---

\* Matt. xxiv. 14.

† Rom. x. 15.

‡ ἡ παράδοσις. It will be shewn hereafter that the four great writers, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen unanimously refer to Tradition in this sense.

already taught by mouth.\* But they never delivered these writings to men not already Christians. One evangelist expressly says that he drew up a narrative in order that his disciple might know the certainty of what he had already been instructed in catechetically, that is, by that great system of oral teaching, by question and answer, that grounding of the truth in the memory, intellect and will, which Christianity had inaugurated, and that he wrote after the pattern of those who had delivered over the word to us, having been its original eyewitnesses and servants.† A second evangelist declares that what he was putting into writing was a very small portion indeed of what his Lord had done.‡ Another very remarkable thing is that the Apostles are not recorded to have put together what they had written themselves, or others by their direction, so as to make it one whole; far less that they ever declared what was so written to contain the complete tradition of what they had received. But what they did was to leave these writings in the hands of particular churches, having in every case addressed them to those who were already instructed as Christians, and not having left among them any document whatever intended to impart the Christian faith to those who were ignorant of it. These writings were in the strictest sense Scriptures of the Church, which sometimes stated, and always in their form and construction showed that they were adapted to those who had been taught the Christian faith by word of mouth. Moreover, it was left to the Church to gather them together, and make them into one book, which thenceforward should be *the Book*; it was left to the Church to determine which were to be received as inspired writings, and in accordance with the teaching already diffused in her, and which were not. And this collection of the several writings from the particular Churches to which they were addressed into one mass would seem not to have taken place until at least three or four generations after the whole order and institutions of the Church had been established by oral teaching, which filled as with a flood the whole Christian people. Then, finally, the authority of the Church

\* See S. Irenæus, iii. 1, expressly stating this of S. Mark's and S. Luke's Gospel, and of the Apostles generally,—quod (Evangelium) quidem tunc præconaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt—which is repeated by Euseb. His., ii. 15, who declares that the Roman Christians not content τῇ ἀγράφῳ τοῦ θεοῦ κηρύγματος διδασκαλία,—besought Mark with many prayers ὥς ἂν καὶ διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ λόγον παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς καταλείψοι διδασκαλίας, which S. Peter afterwards approved.

† Luke i. 2-4.

‡ John xx. 30.

alone established the canon of Scripture, and separated it off from all other writings.

Now as the planting of the Church by oral teaching was a direction of the Holy Spirit, from whom the whole work of mission proceeded, so all these particulars concerning the degree in which writing was to be employed, and the manner in which that writing was to be attested, and the persons to whom it was to be addressed, were a direction of the same Spirit. That a spiritual kingdom could not have been established save by oral teaching Christians may infer with certainty, because, in fact, that method was pursued. That a portion of the great Tradition should be committed to writing they may for the same reason infer to have been necessary for the maintenance of the truth, because it was so done. That these writings were the property of the Church—her Scriptures—may be inferred with no less truth, because they were addressed only to her children, and presupposed a system of instruction already received by those who were to read them. And, finally, that they were to be understood in their right sense only by the aid of the Spirit who dictated them, is, their being given in this manner once admitted, an inference of just reasoning. It is plain, when once these things are stated, that these writings were not intended to stand alone, as ordinary books, and to be understood by themselves. Not only were they part of a great body of teaching, but a portion of a great institution, to which they incessantly alluded and bore witness. They would speak very differently to those without and to those within the kingdom of which they were documents. They would remind the instructed at every turn of doctrines which they had been taught, corroborating these and themselves explained by them. Some of them indeed were letters, and we all know how different is the meaning of letters to those who know the writer and his allusions, and to those who do not. A word of reference in these documents to a great practice of Christian life would kindle into a flame the affection of those who possessed that practice, while it would pass as a dead letter to those who had it not.\* Such

---

\* As one instance out of many take the words of S. Paul, 2 Cor. i. 22 : He that *confirms* us with you in Christ, and that has *anointed* us, is God ; who has also *sealed* us, and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts. How differently would this passage appear to one who had received the confirming chrism, with the words conveying it, *Signo te signo crucis, et confirmo te chrismate salutis* ; and to one who had lost the possession of this Sacrament. Those who have deserted the ecclesiastical tradition and practice read the Scriptures with a negative mind, and so fail to draw out the truth which is in them.



word, therefore, would be absolute proof of the practice to the former, while it would seem vague and indeterminate and no proof at all to the latter.

From what has been said we may determine the relation of the Church to the Scriptures. She having been planted everywhere by the personal oral teaching of the apostles and their disciples, being in full possession of her worship and her sacraments, filled by that word which they had spoken to her, and ruled by that Spirit in whom they had spoken, accepted these writings which they left as conformable to that teaching which they had delivered by word of mouth, esteemed them, moreover, as sacred, because proceeding from the dictation of the one Spirit, and finally put them together and severed them off from all other books, as forming, in conjunction with that unwritten word in possession of which she passed this judgment upon them, her own canon or rule of faith. Thenceforth they were to be for all ages a necessary portion of the divine Tradition which was her inheritance from the Incarnate Word, distributed by His Spirit. They were to be in her and of her. To her belonged, first, the understanding of them; secondly, the interpreting them to her children, out of the fund of that whole Tradition lodged in her, and by virtue of that indwelling Spirit, who, as He had created, maintained her; as part and parcel, moreover, of that whole kingdom, of that body of worship and sacraments, which she is.

And this brings us to a further point of the utmost importance. For the Truth, which is the subject matter of all this divine Tradition or Delivery from the Incarnate Word, in order to be efficacious and permanent, approached men in the shape of a society invested with grace.\* It was not proposed as a theory which is presented simply to the reason, and accepted or rejected by it. True, it was addressed to the reason, but only when illuminated by faith could the reason accept it. Here, again, it showed itself manifestly as "*the gospel of the kingdom.*" It was the good tidings proclaimed, not simply and nakedly to man's intellect, but as the gift and at the same time the law of that kingdom which accompanied its publication by the bestowal of power to accept it, and to make it the rule of conduct. There were many whom the word, though proclaimed to them as to others, did not help, because it was not mixed with faith in those who heard it. S. Paul preached to many when the heart of one Lydia was

---

\* Eine Gnadenanstalt,—our language does not supply the expression.



opened to receive what he announced.\* Thus, with the first hearing of the message coincided the beginning of grace to accept it. But so likewise the Church supplied a storehouse of grace for the continuance of the truth in those who had once received it. Truth and grace, as they come together in her, so they remain together inseparable. Wisdom, understanding, counsel, and knowledge, which perfect the intellect, are linked in her with fortitude, piety, and fear, which perfect the will. And this which is true of the individual is true of the mass. In the Body, as well as in each single member of it, and the more because the body is an incomparably grander creation, it is the sanctified intellect which must receive, harmonize, and develop the truth. If the sevenfold fountain of the Spirit's gifts is one in the individual, much more is it one in that Body out of whose plenitude the individual receives. Thus wherever the Apostles preached the word, if faith made it fruitful, they bestowed the sacraments.

We shall see, if we observe it closely, that it is a triple cord through which the Holy Spirit conveys His life perpetually to the Body; and in His life is the Truth.

First, there is the succession of men. As the Word Incarnate taught, so men bear on His teaching. Personal labours, intercourse from mouth to mouth, the action of men on men, the suffering of men for men, this was from the beginning, this is to be for ever, the mode of spreading His kingdom. It is not a paper kingdom, it cannot be printed off and disseminated by the post. But from His own Person it passed to Peter and the Apostles, and from them to a perpetual succession of men, whose special work it is to continue on this line by a chain never to be broken. These are the messengers, or heralds, or stewards, or ministers, or teachers, or shepherds. They are all and each of these according to the manifoldness of the gift which they carry. Through the unbrokenness of this line the continuity of the gift is secured. Through it the Redeemer, King, and Head touches, as it were, each point of time and space, and with a personal ministry lays hold of each individual through the vast extent of His kingdom in time and space. And the gift is as living and as near to Him now as it was when S. Paul spoke of it as communicated by the imposition of his hands to his disciple; nay, as it was when He himself breathed on His Apostles together assembled, and said, "Receive the Holy Ghost;" and will be equally living and direct from Him to the last who shall receive it to the end of time. And all this because these men who are taken up into

---

\* Heb. iv. 2; Acts xvi. 14.

this succession are the nerves of His mystical Body, through which runs the supply to all the members. This is the indestructible framework which He has wrought for carrying on to men His own teaching, until the whole mass grow up to that fulness of the perfect stature which He has foreseen and determined.

The second succession is that of the Truth itself committed to these men. For that plenitude of teaching which the Apostles delivered orally to the Church has never ceased to rest in her, and out of it she dispenses to all the ages her divine message. But part of this teaching by the further ordering of the Spirit of Truth has been incorporated in writing. And no one can doubt that this incorporation has given a firmness and stability to the teaching which we do not see how it could otherwise have possessed. Thus the great Tradition of the Truth poured out upon the Church has been partly written and partly unwritten; not as if there were two teachings separable from each other, but one and the same which runs in a perpetual blending. Through the written teaching we receive the very words consecrated by our Lord's use: we have the priceless privilege of knowing how He spoke; of catching the accents of His voice and the look of His eyes, and the gestures of His body, portrayed in that narrative. The words of Him who spake as never man spake live and sound for ever in our ears; and we recognize in the structure of His sentences, which convey in a clause principles of endless application, forces on which a universe can be built, the Father's Word, and the world's Creator, and the Church's Head. Parable and apophthegm and answer, metaphor and plain speech, when used by Him, are all impregnated with this power. And, now that we possess this peculiar language of the word Incarnate, embodied and fixed for ever to our senses as well as our affections, it seems as if we could not have done without it. Then the mode in which His own Apostles apply and illustrate His doctrines, and exhibit to us the formation of the society which He came to institute, possesses a value only subordinate to His own words. The written word, it has been said,\* gives to the whole Church through all times a sense of the truth and consistency of her teaching like that which the sense of personal identity gives to the individual respecting his own being. And again, what memory is to the single man, such is the whole tradition of the Truth in the bosom of the Church. But it is through the unwritten teaching deposited in her by the Apostles that she possesses

---

\* By Möhler.

the key to the true understanding of that which is written. The one in her practice has never been severed from the other. So dear has the written word been to her that almost the blackest epithet in language, traitor, is derived from the name which she gave to those who, under fear of persecution, surrendered to the heathen her sacred books. With these in her hand, or rather in her heart, she has directed and carried out that great system of instruction which the Apostles laid down and established by their acts. For to her what they did was as sacred as what they said, or what they wrote; and numberless acts of theirs constituted her teaching originally, and have prolonged and continued it on since.

For, besides the succession of men and the succession of doctrine, there is in her likewise the succession of institutions. As chief of these, but involving a number of subordinate rites, the Apostles with their first oral teaching delivered likewise to the Church sacraments, instituted, not by them, but by their Lord Himself, which at once embodied the truth taught by them, and conveyed the grace by which that truth was to find a home in men's heart and mind. No sooner was the first teaching of Peter at the head of the Apostles uttered, and the gift of forgiveness of sins and of adoption disclosed, than three thousand persons received the double gift by the baptism which followed. Thus they established in the Church seven great rites, encompassing the whole of human life. The regenerating power which was the beginning of the whole change that they sought to work in man was stored up in one; the confirming and developing it in a second; the feeding and increasing it in a third; the removal of obstacles to it in a fourth; the supporting and restoring the human nature so elevated, when under pressure of sickness and in fear of death, in a fifth; the blessing and consecrating the union of the species in a sixth; and, finally, the conferring that distinctive power which transmitted through all ages her Lord's gift to the Church in a seventh. This is that great and marvellous sacramental system by which the Church, dowered, as we have said, in her quality of Bride with her Lord's blood, applies that blood to His members, according to their needs. This is the perpetual consecration of matter to a supernatural end, of which the highest example is found in the Body of the Head Himself, and so it is an enfolding of human nature with the Incarnation, and a transforming it into the image of its Head. But such, likewise, is the summary of the whole written and unwritten teaching of the Church; such also, in few and brief words, the perpetual work of the succession of men whom we have described.

Thus the three successions, of men, of doctrines, and of institutions, are woven by the Holy Spirit together as three strands of a rope which cannot be broken: in the union of these three His perpetual presence dwells; and this is the spinal cord whereby He joins the Body with the Head.

Let us take instances wherein the force of this union is seen.

The first gift He bestowed upon men when the gospel of the kingdom approached them was the forgiveness of sins. This is a power belonging to God alone, as sin is an offence against His majesty. The conferring of this power upon the Apostles by our Lord Himself is explicitly recorded. But then two sacraments exhibit the application of this power, first that of baptism, where it is given plenarily; secondly that of penance, where it is given under restriction. And, further, an order of men is instituted for this perpetual application. Here, then, we see the force of the triple cord carrying on through all ages this great truth of the forgiveness of sins in and by the Church of God. The very definite mention of the grant of this power in the written tradition is not left exposed by itself to the action of unbelieving reason. It has a double bulwark in the two institutions which assert its perpetual exercise as a matter of history, and in the order of men established to carry it out.

Take again the doctrine of the Real Presence, upon which infidelity falls as being a proof charge of human credulity,\* on which faith and love rest as the sovereign gift of God. The recorded words of our Lord Himself express it distinctly and emphatically; further words of His in the sixth chapter of S. John allude to it with equal force, and S. Paul repeatedly refers to it. But this is not enough for the solicitude with which the Holy Spirit has guarded it against all attack. As the great central rite of Christian worship it is presented day after day, in myriads of churches, from age to age, to the eyes and hearts of men. The act in which Christians assemble, in which they offer up at once their repentance and their requests, their thanksgivings and their praises, to Him who has formed them into one Body, lives upon this truth. And further, the order of men which is the backbone of the Church, the great Christian priesthood, made by our Lord in instituting the rite and conferring the gift, exists for its continuance. Against such a truth, defended with such bulwarks, heresy dashes itself with impotent rage in vain.

Thirdly, we have in the epistles of S. Paul a mention of the

---

\* See Macaulay's Essays.

bishop's office and the duties belonging to it. The mention is incidental, and the words not so determinate as in the former instances given. Those who are outside the Body, in their attack upon the necessity of episcopacy, thought that they could cut through these words so as to make it doubtful whether the office of bishop, as distinguished from that of priest, was of original institution. But then history disclosed the fact that when the last apostle was taken from the earth not a church existed which was not under episcopal jurisdiction, and through the whole world, by the institution of bishops, was fulfilled the prediction,—Instead of thy fathers thou shalt have children, whom thou mayest make princes in all lands. Thus, while the written record was interpreted, the unwritten teaching of the Church found a plain and unanswerable proof in her invariable practice. All through her long history she is seen to be governed by bishops; and the words of S. Paul, flanked by the institution and the practice, are more than sufficient to maintain the truth.

Once more let us take the primacy of S. Peter's see in the Church. This, as is well known, rests in the written word mainly on three great passages of S. Matthew, S. Luke, and S. John. These, indeed, are so specific and definite that they convey the dignity intended as clearly as the passages above referred to convey the forgiveness of sins or the Real Presence. But over and above these, what an overwhelming proof in the unbroken succession of those who exercised the primacy from the beginning, and are referred to from age to age by the doctors, fathers, and historians of the Church. Beside the charter of institution stands the long record of the work wrought in virtue of it, the witness of the Church to it in councils, the obedience to it in fact. As the priesthood exists in attestation of the Real Presence, so the primacy stands beside our Lord's words, first promising and then conferring it, like the comment of eighteen hundred years, uniform and consistent.

What we have here applied in the case of the forgiveness of sins, the Real Presence, episcopacy, and the primacy of the Church, might be carried out in the case of many more doctrines forming a part of the great deposit. But it may be well to cite one instance of a truth not contained in the written word at all, which through the unwritten teaching of the Church has passed into universal practice. This is not the abolition only of the Jewish Sabbath, constituted as it was by the most express Divine command, for to that abolition there is a passing reference in an epistle of S. Paul, but the further substitution of the day of the resurrection, the first day of

the week for the seventh, with a modified observance. This rests solely upon the deposit of the Church's unwritten teaching, corroborated by universal practice from the apostolic times.

Viewing, then, the transmission of the Truth as a whole, and the creation of the mystical Body of Christ as its home, and the Holy Spirit as the perpetual Indweller who fills that treasure house of Truth and Grace, we may consider its maintenance as secured by the triple succession or tradition of men, of doctrine, and of institutions which are inseparably joined together in that its home. But there are some words of our Lord so distinctly and transluently expressing all this statement respecting the mode in which His Truth was first and is ever to be transmitted, and the conditions to which His perpetual presence is attached, that we cannot forbear to adduce them.

His parting instructions to His Apostles on the Mountain of Galilee given by S. Matthew run thus: "Jesus approached them and said unto them, All power has been given unto Me in heaven and on earth. Go therefore, and make disciples all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and behold I am with you all days even to the end of the world." We shall here note six things. First, there is the root and foundation of all mission, the power bestowed upon Christ as man, in virtue of the Incarnation: "all power has been given to Me in heaven and on earth;" secondly, there is the derivation of this power from Christ to His Apostles, in virtue of which sent by Him, as He by His Father, they were to go forth: "Go ye therefore;" thirdly, there is the creation of the perpetual teaching power, the authority by which truth was to be imparted: "make disciples all nations." He placed it in them as in one Body, here fulfilling what S. Augustine afterwards expressed, that He "seated the doctrine of Verity in the Chair of Unity." They, invested with one Spirit, His own Spirit of Truth, should go forth and make disciples all nations to one Body of Truth. It is the creation of a power new as the Incarnation, as it is unique, because springing from it, founded and continued in it. He Himself is the one Teacher whose voice they express: He who came on earth for three and thirty years speaks for evermore in those whom He sends as one Body, which calls no man teacher, because it is the Body of Christ, *the* Teacher: so that this function of magisterial teaching is the great distinctive office of His Church, coming from above, and invested with the authority of the God-man,



by which it draws to it disciples, whose consent is not the ground but the result of its authority. Fourthly, there is the creation of the sacraments, as containing the grace which is needed for the reception of this Truth, and they are summed up in the first, which is the beginning of the new life, illumination, and perfection, and which is given in the covenant name of God, as the Christian God, and is the mark of the triune Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, impressed on his own people of acquisition. Thus Grace is for ever associated with Truth as the means whereby alone on earth it shall prevail and be received, and that only as the teaching of that Body whose Head is full of Grace and Truth. Fifthly, there is marked the manner of the teaching, the nature of the magisterial office created as that of a living body of men: "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." The fund from which this teaching is drawn is that whole communication of Truth from the Incarnate Word Himself, given to them by word of mouth, of which we have spoken above as the great Tradition or Delivery; and out of which a part is incorporated in the written word, while the whole dwells ever in the Body created to receive it, from which it is to be imparted by perpetual oral teaching. The teaching, therefore, rests upon the perpetual presence of the Body representing Christ, and as in the days of His flesh He teaches through it, and has fixed part of His tradition in it by writing, not to the exclusion of the rest, but as the charter of a sovereign, the title-deeds of an empire, to be perpetually applied, interpreted, and developed in that whole system of institutions, by that whole race of teachers, in the life of that one Body, which He was creating. And, lastly, to this perpetual living line of teachers, to this perpetual living doctrine, to this perpetual living framework of grace, He has promised His own presence without fail to the end. In this triple succession He is seen, lives, and rules, and this is His Kingdom, His Temple, His Body, His Bride, His Family, to whom He says, Behold, I am with you all days, even to the end of the world.

From these words of our Lord, as from the whole previous argument, we gather that while the Truth which Christ imparted to his apostles was one and complete, its development in its various relations was designedly left as the proper work of such a Body as He created. He Himself spoke as God in human flesh, uttering, that is, creative words, which gathered up in a sentence a germ of truth capable of a long series of applications, and requiring them in order to be understood. And the aptitude to make these applications, so that the truth



proclaimed by Him and committed to His apostles should penetrate through and leaven the whole human society, He gave to His mystical Body. Let us take an instance of this. The Pharisees approached Him one day to entangle Him by their words, and proposed to Him a dilemma from which they thought that He could not escape save by ruining His influence with one great party, or by encountering the danger of being charged with seditious teaching by another. They put to Him the question whether it was lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not. Whereupon He asked them to show Him the tribute money, and pointing to the image of the emperor upon it, uttered those famous words, "Render therefore to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's." Now these words were laid up in the treasury of His Church, and by them she has had to determine the relation between the civil and the spiritual powers in the society created by Him who spake them. Here is a vast development from a small seed: but it is a seed cast by the world's Creator and the Body's Head. And His teaching is full of such seeds, as the history of His Church is one great process of developing and harmonizing and conveying to man the truth thus cast into the fallows of her soil. It is not new truth, for He gave the germ, and no power in man could have developed it without the germ, any more than it could produce the oak without the acorn. It is the same truth, as He taught it, but with that process passed upon it which He intended when He gave it in such a form, and when He made a living Body, to be called by His name, to propagate His teaching, to collect His members into one, and to fill the earth with the knowledge which He brought.

Such a work, therefore, the root and authorization of which we have been attempting to delineate in this paper, stretches over the whole field which Truth and Grace occupy, and over all the relations of men which are summed up in what they are to believe and what they are to do. These ramifications are all but endless. But to all these extends that giving of the Holy Ghost in His fourfold character of the Spirit of Unity, Verity, Charity, and Sanctity, which is the result of the Incarnation, and which makes the Church. What we have said here has a special relation to Truth, and to Christian morals as resting upon Christian dogma. But it is impossible to separate Truth from Grace, in their actual operation as powers: faith and charity in the Christian are linked together, as the intellect and the will are one soul. What we have said is but an introduction to a sketch of the great evolution of dogmatic truth through eighteen centuries:

but in recording its rise, the secret of its growth, and the source of its strength, it was impossible not to bring out the great fact that Christianity was nothing less than a divine life produced in the world over against the existing heathenism, and laying hold of the whole soul of man, in which, as we have just said, intellect and will are inseparable. It did not consist in anything which individuals believed, however true; but in a society of which Truth and Grace were the joint spring, and it was produced in the midst of a world which had to a great extent forfeited both Truth and Grace, while both returned to it as the gift of Christ assuming man's nature. This error and distraction of heathenism, and this great unity of Christian life grounded in faith and charity, which rose up against it, were profoundly felt by all the Fathers, being eye-witnesses of the old world and the new. Their writings express it again and again, with the vividness which only eye-witnesses, who are likewise actors and sufferers, feel. In nothing, perhaps, do they so differ from modern writers as in the energy with which they appreciate the supernatural character of the Christian, and the wonderful being and endowment of that Christian Body which impressed this character on its members. One cause, we may suppose, of this was the sight of heathenism before them with all its impurities and its impotence to produce good. So they were not even tempted to that naturalism which is the besetting sin of our age and these countries. It would have seemed to them not only an ingratitude but an absurdity to refer to the inborn force of humanity a change equally of the intellect and of the will which they saw to belong only to the power of Christ revealed in His Church. We will cite one such passage as a conclusion to this paper, and because it represents the whole train of thought which we have been drawing out.\*

"Of this sacrament, this sacrifice, this priest, this God, before, having been made of a woman, He entered on his mission, all sacred and mystical, angelic and miraculous appearances to our fathers, as well as their own deeds, were resemblances, in order that every creature might in a manner by its acts speak of that One destined to come, in whom should be the salvation of all that were to be restored from death. For as we had started away from the one true supreme God by the injustice of impiety, and fallen out of harmony with Him, and become unstable as water, and wasted ourselves on a multitude of vanities, rent in pieces, and hanging in tatters to every piece, need was there that by the will and

---

\* S. Aug. de Trin., iv. 11, 12, Tom. viii. 817.

command of a compassionating God this multitude of objects itself should utter a cry in unison, calling for One to come; and that thus called upon this One should come, and that the multitude should attest together that the One had come: and so we, discharged from the burden of this multitude, should come to One; and dead in our soul by many sins, and from our sin doomed to death in the flesh, should love that One, who, being without sin, died for us in the flesh: and believing on Him when risen, and with Him rising again in the Spirit through faith, should be justified, being in the One Just made one: and should not despair of rising again in our very flesh, beholding our Head being one going before his many members; in whom now, cleansed by faith, and hereafter restored by vision, and reconciled by the Mediator to God, we might inhere in the One, enjoy the One, and continue One for ever.

“Thus the Son of God, Himself at once the Word of God and Son of man, Mediator of God and men, equal to the Father by the unity of the godhead, and partaker of us through the assumption of the manhood, interceding with the Father for us through that which was man, yet not concealing that as God He was one with the Father, thus speaks: ‘Neither pray I for these alone, but for those also who shall believe through their word on Me, that all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be One in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And the glory which Thou gavest Me, I have given them, that they may be One as we also are One.’ He said not, that I and they may be One thing, although in that He is the Head of the Church, and the Church His Body, He might say, I and they not One thing, but One person, because the Head and the Body is One Christ. But marking His Godhead as consubstantial with the Father (whence in another place He says, I and the Father are One thing), He wills that His own should be One thing in their own kind, that is, in the consubstantial parity of the same nature, but in Him, because in themselves they could not, as severed from each other by diversity of pleasures, desires, and impurities of sin. From these they are cleansed through the Mediator, so as to be One Thing in Him, not merely by the same nature in which all from mortal men become equal to the angels, but likewise by the same will breathing in perfect harmony together into the same beatitude, welded, as it were, by the fire of charity into One Spirit. For this is the force of His words, That they may be One, as We also are One: that as the Father and the Son are One not only in equality of substance, but also in will, so

these also between whom and God the Son is Mediator, may be One Thing not merely by being of the same nature, but also by the same society of affection. And the very point that He is Mediator, by whom we are reconciled to God, He indicates in the words, 'I in them and Thou in Me, that they may be consummated into One.' Thus as through the mediator of death we had receded from our Creator, stained and alienated, so through the Mediator of life we might be purified and reconciled, wherein consist our true peace and stable union with Him."

---

#### ART. VIII.—ROME AND THE REVOLUTION.

*Allocution pronounced by our Holy Father, Pope Pius IX., in the Secret Consistory of 20th November, 1867.*

A YEAR since, writing in this place, we ventured to say these words, "The year that has begun commences in all probability a period far more critical in the history of the Papacy than any of us can even now venture to conceive; but we live in the assured hope and confirmed conviction that that period will end in the mutual destruction of its enemies, and in a triumph of the Church manifest to all mankind." That indications of the commencement of such a period may be found in the events of the past year, we may now perhaps presume to say; but that we are only at the very beginning of such a period, only at the beginning of a work that will occupy the piety, the energy, and the chivalry of Christendom for probably the space of another generation, we rest convinced. The struggle between Rome and the Revolution has barely begun.

This time twelvemonth the French flag had just been lowered from the Castle of S. Angelo, and men said that the Emperor, having with infinite trouble succeeded in escaping from an impracticable position, would take good care never to allow himself to be so involved again. Nevertheless, the French flag has since returned to Rome, in the name not so much of the French Emperor as of the French Legislature and nation, and the military honour of France is at this moment pledged to the defence of the Pope's civil sovereignty in a way that it was not at the time of the Convention of September, or even of the original intervention ordered by the Republic in 1849. When the French flag was so withdrawn from Rome, the world waited not very impatiently, but with a perfectly cool

confidence, to see the fabric of the Papal sovereignty fall asunder of its own accord. It was believed that the Roman population was altogether disaffected—that whenever the Party of Action gave a certain signal, the whole edifice of the Pontifical administration would come down with a crash—and then happy Italy should behold Pius IX. vanishing in a Spanish frigate, while Victor Emmanuel embraced Garibaldi on the Capitol. But weeks and then months wore away. The Roman Government discharged its difficult duties with its ordinary diligence, and with the greater ease that any administration must feel on being relieved from the conflicting authority and the considerable charge of a foreign army of occupation. The Roman population exhibited only the ordinary silent signs of loyalty and contentment. There were no disturbances in the city, except a few outrages of the character of that of Clerkenwell—a bomb-shell, or a powder-grenade flung by some more than usually enthusiastic and nimble-heeled Garibaldian opposite a church door or a public office. In the provinces all was perfectly peaceful, and the sudden virulent outbreak of cholera at Albano, and several other points of the Patrimony, gave a sad but perfect occasion for proving how thorough was the harmony which existed between the Papal Government, the foreign soldiers in its service, and the Roman peasantry. Eight months passed after the French had evacuated Rome, and yet Rome did not seem to covet the honour of becoming capital of Italy. Then the Revolution suddenly rushed to the rescue. It had every conceivable advantage of opportunity in its favour. The Papal Government so little expected attack that a large proportion of its foreign troops was on furlough. The French Government was supposed to be altogether occupied with the affairs of Germany. The Government of Florence acted with characteristic baseness and bad faith. Its frontier was so ill-guarded that the Garibaldian bands swarmed across it by the thousand, and its own soldiers deserted by battalions. Then the Avatar of Revolution, escaping from the custody of a fleet and a regiment at Caprera, arrived in Florence, had conferences with the minister who was going out, and the minister who was supposed to be coming in, harangued his followers opposite the King's palace, and proceeded in a special train to the seat of war. Men remembered how he had gone to Sicily with a thousand followers, far less sure of Cavour's support then than of Ratazzi's now. They said that the tread of his foot on its soil had sufficed to shake an ancient and a popular dynasty out of its throne, and that an army of 100,000 men had dispersed at the sight of his shirt. From Geneva he had announced to the universe that he was going to Rome in order

to depose the Vicar of Christ, and establish the religion of God; and he promised his bands, in words forcible, if filthy, that they would hardly have occasion to use the arms of soldiers with such an enemy as they would meet in the army of the Pope. The rest of the story is simply told. In those thin ranks of young men, but few of whom had ever seen war before, stood a forlorn hope of the chivalry of Christendom, the sons of the Crusaders face to face with the vanguard of the Revolution. Wherever they met in scuffle or skirmish, and at last in the general engagement of Mentana, the soldier of the Pope could afford to give his enemy odds, and beat him. In dashing and in steady courage—in rapidity of movement, energy and ardour in the discharge of duty, in resolute endurance of fatigue, and patience under privation, no army could excel that of His Holiness, nor equal it in its touching charity towards its wretched enemy—an enemy which regarded and employed wholesale assassination as one of the legitimate means of war. Often after the battle the Papal Zouave passed the untasted fruit to the parched lips of the Garibaldian, or told the surgeon to dress his wounds first. The charity of these noble soldiers was of the same quality as their courage. Nor were the honours of war due to them alone. Throughout the invaded districts, bands of the peasantry gave them active support, and at their own desire were being armed and embodied as militia by the Government when the French intervention was announced. But even before that intervention, no military man in Europe would venture to say that the Garibaldian campaign had a chance of success, such was the front that the Pope's army and the Pope's people had opposed to it at Bagnorea, Monte Libretti, Nerola, Monte Rotondo. A French brigade brilliantly closed the battle of Mentana, in which, however, the part that it had taken was so little observed that even the French Government did not for some days claim its due share in the victory. A Government telegram from Florence announced to the world that Garibaldi and his sons, utterly defeated by the Papal army, had fled from the field of battle. The prestige of the Revolution thus sustained its first shock. The tide which had overrun Parma, Modena and Tuscany, the Legations, the Marches, and the two Sicilies, had broken at last—whether to rise to a yet higher wave or to ebb slowly away remains to be seen. But in that brief time three points were conclusively proved. It was proved that the Pope's subjects in the City and in the Patrimony are loyal to his rule with a loyalty which any of the great powers, Russia, Austria, Prussia, France, or England (it would be an irony to speak of Italy) might be glad to see transplanted to some of their states. It



was proved that the Roman army, whether of native or foreign origin, stood together as one man, gave no sign of faltering or defection, spared its enemy neither steel nor lead until he was beaten, and was then ready to treat him with such generosity as befits an army of Christian gentlemen. It was proved that the French nation was determined that among the *Gesta Dei per Francos* in this age should be a loyal support of the Vicar of Christ in his civil dominions, and that on this point at least the Emperor and his Government should do its implicit will. Finally, it is the simple truth to say there is only one Government in Europe which could afford to be so magnanimous in the use of such a success. The Garibaldians had committed all the ordinary crimes of civil war, and some extraordinary excesses. They had mined several public buildings, and blown up one with the loss of six times as many lives as the Clerkenwell explosion caused. They had murdered men in cold blood; they had insulted and ill-treated prisoners; they had committed scandalous sacrileges of such a nature as it would be an offence to pious ears to repeat. But the Pope sent no Garibaldians to the gibbet or even to the galleys. The moment his enemies were at his mercy he only remembered that they were his children, and sent them home with his forgiveness and his blessing.

While for a brief time Rome enjoys the repose necessarily consequent upon a victory so complete both in a moral and a material point of view, all Christendom may well admire and emulate the splendid example which France has set to other nations. There has not been a more remarkable reaction of opinion in our times than that Catholic reaction, the force of which has compelled the Emperor, evidently against his natural inclination and the steady course of his policy for the last eight years, to assume as a permanent obligation of French public honour the defence of the civil sovereignty of the Holy See in its present extent. The friends of Constitutional Government in France have a right to rejoice in the fact that the first great triumph of a Parliamentary majority under the Empire (for in comparison with it the vote on the Pelikao dotation is not worthy of mention) was the triumph of that majority which sustained M. Thiers in compelling the Imperial Government to declare itself without reserve and without ambiguity for the Pope. This too is a great moral and material victory, a sign of reviving enlightenment in a blundering and criminal age, a proof that there is true progress more or less possible in a world fast falling into anarchy and bankruptcy—this spectacle of a great Catholic people uttering its will unanimously by the voices of its



elected representatives in a policy perfectly flowing from its religious instincts and its national traditions. It is the more welcome to us because it removes at once the question of the relation of the French Government to the Holy See out of the degrading category of dynastic questions. The French flag went to Rome in 1849 under the Republic, and returned to Rome in 1867 under the Empire, because the French nation, which is Catholic before being either Bourbonist or Bonapartist, Orleanist or Republican, so willed it. And the event which happened in the French Corps Législatif a month ago is chiefly valuable because it is an authentic record that the French nation regards the protectorate of the Sovereign Pontiff in his civil principality as a canon of its foreign policy—to be violated at the peril of its dynasty for the time being. “It is a curious fact,” said M. Thiers, quite lately, to one of our friends, “it is a curious fact that, whenever I have to speak on religious questions, I feel that the House goes with me as one man, and this happens on no other occasion.” But what is the secret of it? France, deprived of the blessing of an authentic government ever since the Revolution—for the Restoration was achieved by foreign bayonets, and every other Government established by *coup d'état* or barricades—lives subject to the constant torment of revolutionary passions; but she remains Catholic at the bottom of her heart, and becomes more and more Catholic every day in the habit of her life. Let her see a Catholic interest in peril anywhere in the world, and the blood of her saints and soldiers flames through all her veins. Again, the class of men upon whom is now devolving the real burden of French affairs, in the Legislature, in the Council of State, in the Ministry, on the Bench, are in a great measure men of very different religious ideas from their predecessors. They are the men who, as college youths, flocked to Lacordaire's and de Ravignan's Conferences, regarded Montalembert as the ideal of a Catholic leader, and helped Ozanam to found the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. “The men of forty govern the world;” and such men are in a considerable degree good Catholics nowadays in France, especially in official life. “*Mais c'est un clerical!*” observed to the Emperor one of his confidants on hearing of M. Pinard's appointment to the Ministry of the Interior. “*Je le sais bien, mais cela m'est égal*” was His Majesty's curt reply. There are great gaps in the band of statesmen who shared his councils ten years ago. MM. de Morny, Fould, Billault, Thouvenel, have prematurely died; de Persigny, Walewski, and Drouyn de Lhuys appear to have permanently lost the Imperial confidence. M.

Rouher's authority has, in consequence, lately attained such a supremacy that men speak of the Vice-Emperor. On the opposition side, there is only one even presentable candidate for office, M. Olivier, and even he appears to be much more impossible than presentable. The Emperor must therefore choose his ministers from among the majority or the class of men in whom the majority have confidence—and the majority is Catholic first and Imperialist afterwards, which is the precise reason why M. Thiers is enthusiastically applauded when he speaks on the affairs of Rome, and heard with cold curiosity on all other topics.

That the Emperor intended to evade his duty towards the Pope at the commencement of the recent crisis is unfortunately only too evident. For weeks before the crisis came, Garibaldian committees were openly occupied in every principal Italian town getting ready men and material for the invasion. Garibaldi himself had most publicly declared his intentions. The French Government did not call upon the Government of Florence to dissolve the committees and prosecute their president. But on the 30th of September, while the Roman population was in a state of complete tranquillity, a strange communication took place between the two Governments. Signor Ratazzi telegraphed to his minister at Paris these words:—

It appears certain that within a few days a revolution will break forth at Rome, which, in spite of all our efforts, it is impossible for us to prevent. We have been able to resist the movement which manifested itself in Italy, respecting and causing to be respected the Convention of the 15th of September, and, even at the risk of wounding the national sentiment, we will continue to do so in case the Pontifical troops should suffice to suppress the movement. But it would be absolutely impossible for us to assist as indifferent spectators at the establishment in Rome of a government which might be dangerous to Italy and the monarchy. In presence of such an eventuality, which has not been foreseen by the Convention, we shall be necessarily constrained to intervene in order to save public order and to protect our institutions.\*

The Emperor Napoleon was not in the least degree ignorant—the despatches of his Government and the speeches of his Ministers prove it, and facts have proved it—that there was not the slightest disposition towards a revolution on the part of the Roman population, and that S. Ratazzi's description of the conduct of his Government in regard to the Convention of

---

\* "Italian Green Book," Despatch X.

September was a flagrant falsehood. It was an occasion, if ever there was one, in which it was His Majesty's duty and policy to make his mind plainly known. But what did he say? This is S. Nigra's account of it, dated 4th October, and it has not been contradicted:—

His Majesty has said to me that the question of deciding what shall be done in the case of a republican revolution at Rome cannot be resolved *a priori* independently of the circumstances which may have provoked it; that the conduct of the two governments must be chiefly guided by these circumstances, and by the impression which they may produce upon public opinion; that for the moment all immediate danger appears to have vanished, and that regarding the actual state of affairs, he feels it to be his duty to promise that in the case of new events, his government will abstain from taking resolutions and measures without having first put itself in communication with the government of the King, and endeavouring to act in accord with it.\*

Every one knows what the conduct of the Government of Florence became from this date forward. On the 12th the Emperor, while "still recognizing the sincerity of the efforts of the Government of the King," said that if the Italian army was unable to prevent invasion of the Papal States by the Garibaldian bands, the French Government must act. To this S. Ratazzi had the inconceivable effrontery to reply:—"They are isolated volunteers, and not Garibaldian bands, who enter the Roman territory. If the Roman population remains tranquil, it is due solely to the attitude of the Government of the King, which renders impossible any invasion of sufficient importance to provoke an insurrection. . . . I believe that affairs have arrived at such a pass, that it is difficult to avoid an occupation of the Pontifical territory by part of our army. It is the only way to make an end of it. . . . At all events, it is absolutely necessary to make the Imperial Government understand that a French intervention would be the most unfortunate resolution which it could adopt, and that it would compel us to recur to the most dangerous expedients in order to save ourselves from its consequences."† Then hearing that French intervention was beginning to be really contemplated, he declared: "If the French troops are sent to Rome, we shall be compelled to interfere, and we shall certainly occupy the Pontifical territory. It is for us an absolute necessity, if we want to avoid a civil war and to save our institutions." Still the Imperial Government hesitated,

---

\* "Green Book," Despatch XI.

† "Green Book," Despatch XIX.

and S. Ratazzi's threats seemed to have a certain effect. On the 15th of October, S. Nigra telegraphed: "My observations have produced a certain effect. Nevertheless, I do not feel altogether at ease. In the actual state of affairs, one might perhaps propose, with some chance of success, the following combination:—The Italian troops will occupy the Pontifical territory in order to re-establish order; tranquillity once restored, they will resume their position on the frontiers. During this interval, Italy, in concert with France, shall propose a Congress of the Great Powers to be held at Florence, to settle the Roman question definitively." To this Signor Ratazzi replied: "Occupation by all means, but no Congress, or at least only a Congress to provide guarantees for the exercise of the Pope's spiritual powers." It is interesting to reflect that at this date the Sub-Alpine Prime Minister considered the Pope's temporal government was utterly at an end, and believed himself in a condition to fulminate a threat of war against France. "We wish, if possible" he telegraphs, "to avoid a Congress, as we do not believe it will yield any favourable results. It would be necessary, on the other hand, that it should be well understood that its business should be to secure the *spiritual independence*. . . . I have already recommended you to address all your efforts to prevent the French occupation. Hold it for certain that we are resolved to cross the frontier with our troops, and to make them march on Rome at the first news of the departure of the French fleet from Toulon." It was only after this most insolent message that the French Government finally decided to dispatch its expedition. This point was settled in principle at a council of the ministers held at Saint Cloud on October 16th. Nevertheless, the Emperor's mind, and even the Vice-Emperor's, appeared still to vacillate. On the day after this council, S. Nigra writes:—"M. Rouher would wish a double intervention operated in concert, but he will not take the initiative of such a proposition." On that same day, however, the Pope declared that he would abandon Rome if Italy intervened. This simple, straightforward declaration seems to have exercised a magnetic effect on the attitude of the French Government. S. Nigra was obliged to telegraph immediately to Florence these definitive words:—"The Imperial Government will not admit of the intervention of our troops under any circumstances. If a revolution should break forth at Rome, that revolution will be regarded here as the consequence of our invasion;" and on the following day he urged on S. Ratazzi the necessity of showing by some vigorous act which should remove all doubt the firm intention of the Government of the King to

repress the movement. The Emperor, even when face to face with all this incoherent insolence, long hesitated, delayed, then revoked the order for the sailing of the squadron; and after it had sailed, still tried to recall it. As long as it was possible, he endeavoured to maintain the ambiguous policy so fatal to French honour, so disastrous to the interests of the Holy See, which the successive attempts of Italian assassins upon his life for so many years past first led him into. But at last the voice of the French nation became too clear and too stern to be mistaken.

For more than a year the Emperor had asked the French nation to eat dirt. In the summer of 1866, when Austria and Prussia went to war, he was, or was supposed to be, arbiter of Europe. Then it happened that in the course of a war of a week, it became demonstrated that Prussia was the superior military power to France, and ready to test its supremacy if France should venture to covet an inch of soil beyond her northern frontier. Italy, under cover of the Prussian alliance, insulted France in the matter of the cession of Venetia; the United States ordered the French army to evacuate Mexico; and without consideration for the Emperor Maximilian, the French Government settled the terms of evacuation with the Cabinet of Washington, just as it had arranged the terms of the Convention of September, without reference to the Pope. The dreadful death of the Emperor Maximilian followed—a stain on the second empire hardly differing in degree from that of the Duc d'Enghien's on the first. Though the Exposition drew all the world and half the world's Sovereigns to Paris, Paris itself was ill at ease. Panic had established itself on the Bourse. The great financial lever of the empire, the *Credit Mobilier*, seemed threatened with ruin. Men who know the world well say the South Sea Bubble would be but a trifle to its fall. But, by a desperate effort, its difficulties were averted or delayed. It was at this time that the Government of Florence thought that France might be brought to bear the last and deadliest insult to its honour; and if France had allowed its Emperor to pursue his own policy, King Victor Emmanuel would probably be wintering in the Quirinal. But as soon as the French people heard of the Garibaldian invasion, and of the glorious resistance which the Papal volunteers (so many of whom bore the oldest and bravest names in France) were making against tremendous odds, a cry of wrath and shame rose from the whole nation. Reports came up from each department that a spirit of surly and stubborn discontent was spreading fast among the soundest part of the population. Many of the most influential members of the two Houses wrote in an angry

tone to the Prime Minister, protesting against the wavering policy of the Government in regard to the Italian manœuvres and attacks. Significant threats of defection were even uttered, and the impression was deepened by the bold and uncompromising attitude of the clergy, headed by their Bishops and Cardinals.

Such was the state of affairs in France when the Chambers met on the 18th of November. The battle of Mentana had been fought on the 3rd; Garibaldi re-arrested on the 4th; the Italian troops withdrawn from the Papal territory on the 5th. So far all had gone well for Catholic interests and the honour of France. But even at this date it began to be whispered that the Emperor was disappointed at the completeness of his own success; and that in the conditions of the Conference, for which invitations were issued on the 9th, much was about to be yielded to the suggestions of the Government of Florence. Just before the meeting of the Legislative Bodies, it became known that General Menabrea had actually summoned the French Government to withdraw its troops from the Pontifical territory; and, moreover, that the evacuation had really been commenced *post hoc*, and apparently *propter hoc*. The French flag was in fact formally lowered at Rome on the 3rd of December. It was on that day that the debate commenced in the French Corps Législatif. All that indignant dissatisfaction which had permeated the most solid and loyal part of French society, and which tended to make the government majority at once the most disciplined, difficult, and intractable element in the management of affairs; all the long-suppressed national shame, suddenly culminated to achieve for the great orator of the Opposition the greatest Parliamentary triumph that has been won in our time. Never perhaps before has a great government made so sudden and complete a transformation of its policy under the mere influence of opinion as the Imperial Government made between the 3rd and the 5th of December. The Marquis de Moustier came down to the House as the apologist of the Government of Florence. He declared that he was not there to decide which side was right or which wrong in the differences between that Government and the Papacy. He spoke of the Syllabus as a work which should not trouble the conscience of a good Frenchman: "a work of circumstances, a work much more political than religious, the last protest of the *ancien régime* against the new order dating from the French Revolution." He concluded with these words:—"If, after all, the Conference do not meet, and do not succeed in settling the question, we shall make new arrangements with the Italians, and leave the Pope to their loyalty."



But the indignation with which the whole House heard this declaration was so extraordinary and so pronounced that it was judged expedient to alter the words in the official report into a confused statement, that in case the Conference failed, the French Government would fall back on the Convention of 1864, requiring from the Italian Government further guarantees for its execution. M. Thiers immediately followed, and in a speech of unmatched ability, both as to the profundity of its views and the simple energy of its style, occupied and exhibited the whole extent of the subject; so that when he had spoken the House seemed to feel that nothing more remained to be said, and that it would be an impertinence to interfere between the orator, not of its choice, who had nevertheless spoken its mind so well, and the Government in which its confidence had been so rudely shaken. During that night a complete change came over the policy of the Empire. Doubtless the Foreign Minister had had the Emperor's authority for what he said on Wednesday, but M. Thiers's speech was not a more complete contradiction of its whole tone and texture than was the speech which the Prime Minister delivered soon after the House met on Thursday. He began by a fierce denunciation of the Italian pretensions to Rome as part of a scheme of conspiracy against the religion and public order of Europe; he treated with haughty scorn the audacious stratagems and treacheries, and the real weakness of the Government of Florence; he even attacked King Victor Emmanuel, now, as he said, suffering the chastisement of his folly in leaguings with the Revolution for the annexation of the kingdom of Naples; he further declared that when he heard the Opposition speak of the Syllabus as a *casus belli*, "his spirit and his intelligence were both confounded"; finally he exclaimed, "Here is the dilemma: The Pope needs Rome for his independence. Italy aspires to Rome, which she considers as an imperious necessity of her unity. Very well, then. Now we declare, in the name of the French Government, Italy shall not possess herself of Rome. Never" (and the word was echoed throughout the House), "never will France suffer that violence to be done to her honour and to Catholicity. She demands the energetic application of the Convention of the 15th September, and if that Convention does not prove for the future efficacious enough, she will supply its defects herself. . . . Italy will find France on the road to Rome, the day on which she attempts to invade the Pontifical territory. . . . And by Rome I mean the actual territory of the Holy See in all its integrity. There is not the least



equivocal in our intention on this subject." M. Rouher had some right, it must be admitted, to ask the House, as he did, when he had made these categorical declarations, "Is that clear?" But the House had also a right to remark that M. de Moustier, speaking in the same place and on behalf of the same government, only twenty-four hours before, had been very far from clear. All was now, however, forgotten, except the simple and unsophisticated programme of the Minister, and the complete *solidarité* of the Assembly on the subject was shown by the vote which followed, in which 237 voted for the order of the day, and 17 against.

A French journalist of eminent discernment, writing of this great Parliamentary debate a few days afterwards, said, men will in future speak of the sitting of December 5th, whenever they speak of the Convention of September 15th. The one is the exegetic commentary of the other. And, in truth, all the events which have since happened in connection with the Roman question are simply corollaries of that great step towards a return to a constitutional system of government in France. The Italian Parliament met on the following day, but on the first opportunity that offered it brought the government of the country to a dead-lock. The Menabrea Ministry was defeated by a majority of two on the 22nd of December, and its defeat was intended by the majority of those who voted as a reply to M. Rouher's *jamais, jamais!* This division again was effected by what men of the world call an accident. There are, it seems, in this astounding assembly, two Ultramontane members, Count Crotti and S. D'Ondes Reggio—persons, we should say, about the most deserving of sympathy among articulate-speaking Parliamentary men. They had proposed an amendment of their own to the order of the day, to the effect that Rome was the capital, not of Italy, but of the Catholic world, and so were obliged to vote against the Government, which, if it were merely a question of expediency, they would probably have supported. But it happened that these two votes made the difference between a majority and a minority; and the consequence is that a ministerial crisis of a peculiarly complicated and obstinate character has occurred. In the state at which Italian affairs have arrived in fact, Parliamentary government is all but impossible, and being so, the sooner it becomes altogether impossible the better—Parliament being, we take it, rather a means than an end. The Italian Parliament is not a Parliament in our sense of the word at all. It cannot, in the first place, produce government by party, or give anything like abiding confidence to its statesmen. The list of ministers since

Cavour's death is a little limbo of ruined reputations ; men who fall one after another, without an apparent cause, but irretrievably. Where now is the austere pompous Ricasoli, half Cato, half Cloots ? What has become of the nimble-minded, not too dainty-handed Minghetti ? Why does La Marmora, the hero of Custozza, and who has won victories as great in the Senate, why does he sulk in his tent ? Ratazzi, most astute, adroit, accomplished of Italian statesmen, beautifully varnishing the principles of Machiavelli with the manner of Mephistopheles—over what a precipice has he tumbled ? Who so hopeless as the Minister whose name is even imagined to mean war with France ? The one man in Italy who is really capable of wielding the sword of State, Cialdini, has again and again refused to form a Government—he for one knowing the limits of the possible. Surely the stars of Heaven look down on no more tragically ludicrous spectacle these winter nights than on King Victor Emmanuel and his aide-de-camp, putting their not over-luminous heads together to make a Ministry,—a Ministry that shall, above all things, exclude, if possible, every person who ever was in office before. What would Englishmen say of such a system of Parliamentary government if it existed in Spain or Austria ? And what of the Italian discharge of that other great function of Parliament, the guardianship of the finances ? This year's deficit at Florence is estimated at from ten to twelve millions sterling ; and this year is neither worse nor better than any year since the Italian kingdom came to be known on the Stock Exchange. How long it can stagger on through debts and deficits without actual dissolution is almost rather a question for the actuary or the broker than the politician. Its last financial act, the refusal to pay the interest on the Pontifical Debt of the Marches and Legations, is a dashing stroke of political unwisdom. To deny its obligation to pay the debt, having once admitted it, is to raise again the question of its right to those provinces. Let us rejoice that it has done so, and that the Roman Government unhesitatingly meets the liability ; and let our Peter's Pence make the unexpected pressure only a "flea-bite" (to borrow Mr. Disraeli's fine figure) on the Papal treasury.

The year that begins promises to be one of the greatest in the annals of the Church. It begins with the revival of a spirit which even the faithful supposed to be extinct ; it will end with the opening of a new ecclesiastical epoch. When Edmund Burke heard that a French Queen had been led to the scaffold seventy years ago, he said the Age of Chivalry is dead. Twenty years ago chivalry seemed to have had a false resurrection, and

men feared that its spirit had passed into the Revolution—the red shirt of the Garibaldian travesty of the Crusader's coat of mail. But once more, thank God, the young men of Christendom are touched by the same fire that fell from the lips of Peter the Hermit, and are rallying in ranks that represent every Catholic nation round the throne of the Pontiff. To give the Pope an army competent thoroughly to defend his present territory against any sudden attack is a duty well begun and to be thoroughly done. When the General Council shall meet, as it is hoped it will meet at the end of the year, it is meet and just, right and available, that its deliberations should be protected by a rampart of the chivalry of all the Catholic nations. The work which the Council has to do is a work that concerns all nations. The Syllabus, which we may regard as a programme of its deliberations, indicates all the evils of the present age, from its false epithets, such as "Progress," and "Liberalism," and "Modern Civilization," to its frantic propensity towards anarchy and its utter disregard or rather darkness to public law—from the debased standard of its moral life, more and more tending to become accepted by the civil law, to the disposition of its Governments to regard (as Mr. Grattan once said) "God Almighty as a tolerated alien in his own creation." False philosophies and false politics, a return to Paganism under the pretence of Progress, an armed peace which is no peace, wars made without warrant, heresies turning into heathenisms, the steady spread of one giant schism daily becoming more intolerant and presumptuous, and now asserting that the time has come to depose the Pope from the Primacy of Christendom in order to set the Czar up in his place,\* the awful general diminution of truths among men—such is what we see around us in the world. Such is its condition as depicted by our present Holy Father again and again. The work which lies before a General Council in such an age is weighty—weighty as that which called together the Fathers of Trent; but no Council of the Church has ever been unequal to the height of its inspiration and the evils of its age, nor shall the Sixth of Lateran.

---

\* Incredible as it may seem, there has been an evidently inspired article to this effect in the *Moscow Gazette*, an official organ, within the last month; and the idea is countenanced by the recent frightful persecutions of the Catholic Church in Poland and other parts of the Russian dominions.

## Notices of Books.

---

### *Pastorals of the English Bishops on the Education of Catholics at the Protestant Universities.*

SINCE our last number, all the English bishops have earnestly warned their respective subjects against education at the Protestant Universities. Our readers will thank us for here recording the passage which their lordships have quoted, from that letter of Propaganda which conveyed the decision of the Holy See :—

“ You will clearly explain in your pastoral letter the doctrines of the Church about avoiding the danger of mortal sin ; to which no one without grievous sin can expose himself, unless under the pressure of serious and adequate necessity, and unless such precautions be employed as may remove the proximate danger of sin. In the present case, where, as his Holiness has declared, those who frequent the universities incur an intrinsic and most grievous danger to purity of morals as well as to faith, which is absolutely necessary to salvation, who can fail to see that it is next to impossible to discover circumstances which would allow Catholics, without sin, to attend non-Catholic universities ? The light and unstable minds of youth, the errors which in such institutions are imbibed almost through the atmosphere, without being counteracted by more solid doctrine, the very great power which human respect and the taunts of their companions exercise upon young men, lead them so readily and so immediately into the danger of falling, that generally no sufficient reason can be conceived why young men should be entrusted to these universities. Such being the case, you in your wisdom will so use the arguments of authority and reason in publishing this letter, that it may be at length clearly seen, as well by all the clergy as by the faithful, what it is their duty to think and to do in this most grave matter.”

The Holy Father then has himself declared, that those who frequent the English national universities “ incur an intrinsic and most grievous danger ” both to faith and morals. But, argues Propaganda, it is in itself mortally sinful to expose yourself to such danger, unless under the pressure of necessity ; which here does not exist. “ *It is next to impossible,*” adds the Congregation, “ to discover circumstances which would allow Catholics without [mortal] sin to attend non-Catholic universities.”

*Rome and the Revolution.* A Sermon preached by HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster, on Rosary Sunday, 1867. London : Longmans.

*Christ and Antichrist.* A Sermon preached by HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster, at the Mass of Requiem for those who fell in defence of Rome. London : Longmans.

PROBABLY no English Catholic has mastered by any means so thoroughly as the Archbishop, the full bearing of all those questions and interests which are concentrated on the Holy Father's civil sovereignty. Whenever therefore he is called upon to express himself on any portion of this great theme, such expression must be taken, not as an isolated fragment, but as part of one profound and consistent whole. Our readers cannot do better than, while they bear this fact in mind, to study the following passages from the above-mentioned two sermons. The italics are our own.

"All the enmities against the Divine truth and the Divine law, against the Church and its morality, against religious orders and the priesthood, fall at once upon the chief witness for the revelation of Christianity, the Head of the Church, the guardian of morality, and the protector of the priesthood. All these things meet eminently in his person, and all the hatred of the world against these things he bears in an eminent degree, and that in our behalf. There is an instinct in the world which tells it that if *the shepherd be smitten the sheep of the flock might be scattered*; that if the head of the Christian superstition could be overthrown, the battle would be half won. Therefore it is that all the conspiracies of men are attracted to one point. Their whole array of heresy and schism, of infidelity and impiety, of sedition and revolution, is directed against the person who in himself sums up and represents to the world the rights of God and of His Church. You see then before you the two persons, and the two systems. The conflict is perpetual, and their enmity is irreconcilable. They may be called two Churches and two Gospels. On the one side is the Church of 'men of good will,' one, holy, visible, and universal; on the other, the *ecclesia malignantium*, as the Scriptures call it, the Church of men of evil will; one in enmity against the Church of God, though manifold as the multiplicity of evil; unholy in thought, word, deed, intention and will; invisible, because secret, stealthy, subterraneous, working out of sight, and in darkness undermining the private purities of home, the public order of States, the thrones of princes, above all the throne of the Sovereign Pontiff, in whom both spiritual and civil powers unite. It is not more certain that the Catholic Church spreads visibly over the earth than that an anti-Christian conspiracy of infidelity and revolution spreads in secret under the Christian world. These two systems are in presence of each other. *Hitherto the Christian order has maintained its supremacy.* How long it shall endure, God only knows. So long as there is a Christian world, the temporal power of the Pontiffs will be sustained by its conscience and its instincts; *when the temporal power is dissolved the Christian world will be dissolved with it.* Therefore, all the storm is pointed at the Vicar of Christ. He holds the key of the position; or rather, his own sacred person is its strength. *And these two Churches have their two Gospels.* The one is contained in the Encyclical and Syllabus of Pius IX. in 1864. In it are condemned the chief errors which are now menacing the Christian

society of the world. The other was preached the other day at Geneva. In the former are promulgated the great truths and laws on which the Church, the State, and the family repose. It declares the obligations and authority of reason and revelation, of the Christian and civil law, of the Church and of the State. It confirms the lawful authority of rulers, and the duty of obedience in subjects. It is the Gospel of order, peace, and purity to all mankind. The other is incomprehensible, indeed, but happily not divine. Its chief dogmas are 'that the Papacy must be destroyed,' and 'that the religion of God must be propagated throughout the world.' At the sound of a religion to be propagated, the indeavour and indocile disciples cried 'No, no.' But the religion of God was soon so explained as to allay their fears. It is the religion of science, of reason, and of genius, the apostles of which I will not name." ("Rome and the Revolution," pp. 13-15.)

"The influence of this country for good or for evil, for order or for disorder, is great. As a Christian and an Englishman I deplore the licence of nameless writing and irresponsible speech, which, for the last twenty years, throughout the whole Pontificate of Pius IX., has encouraged and stimulated the anti-Christian revolutions of the Continent. We have among us public voices which make themselves heard far and wide. And they, too, have preached the gospel of sedition. *They would not have proclaimed the same maxims for the guidance of our own colonies or for the three kingdoms of our own country.* But against the Pope anything is lawful. I will not quote chapter and verse, nor name the evangelists of these fatal doctrines. It is enough to recite a few axioms of their political morality. We are told that a people may lawfully at any time, and for any cause, overthrow its Government: that the will of the people is a sufficient justifying reason: that national aspirations are legitimate and supreme motives for the dissolution of a Government, even though confirmed by possession, prescription, and immemorial right: that a discontented minority may lawfully call in the aid of foreign sedition and foreign arms to overthrow its Government: that the principle of non-intervention binds Governments, but not individuals: that even Governments bound not to interfere openly may do so secretly, that they may do by 'moral countenance' and encouragement in words what they may not do by arms: that they may look on approvingly when their subjects sow sedition in the peaceful provinces of neighbouring states, organise conspiracies in their capitals, and send arms and money to the conspirators. All these things have been publicly preached among us; and these evil seeds wafted all over the three kingdoms, all over the empire, have already fallen on a prepared soil and are bearing bitter fruit. *We designed them only for our neighbours, or only for the Pope; but they have struck root in our own land,* and we shall reap as we have sown. As a Christian and an Englishman I protest against this gospel of sedition; and I pray God that my country may not, by the remotest influence or by a passing word, be partaker in its diffusion; that its public opinion, and loud public voice, and the power of its Legislature, may be restrained by Christian order and by international justice, and that we may not be guilty before God of abetting by the lightest act, the infidel revolution which now threatens the Vicar of Jesus Christ" (pp. 18-20).

"There is a unity higher than the unity of any nation, in which the welfare of all nations is bound up: the unity of the Christian world. *The maintenance of this unity in its head and centre, in its order, and laws of national justice and co-operation, is the highest interest of all nations, and the guarantee of their reciprocal duties and rights.* England isolated itself from the Christian world in religion three hundred years ago, and its present attitude of political isolation is the inevitable result. Russia, in like manner, is cut off from Europe by its schism, and its schism dictates its policy.



Prussia is still half united to the Catholic world. The other nations of Europe are, for the most part, or altogether, members of the Catholic unity. *It is not possible for any one of them to claim the Russian or English exemption from national responsibility to a higher unity, without renouncing their Catholic character.* This, in an evil hour, Italy has been lured, taunted, tempted to do. And in an evil hour it has listened. It has claimed the capital of Christendom by a vote of its Parliament as the capital of Italy, but the Catholic world will not submit to this usurpation: and France, not as France, but as the mandatory of the Catholic Powers, has defeated, and will defeat, the usurpation, and protect the centre of Catholic unity and the Head of the Catholic world. This is our answer. The unity of Christendom will not make way for the unity of Italy. (Christ and Antichrist, pp. 6, 7.)

"The Catholic world, neither now nor hereafter—neither at the decease of Pius IX., nor yet at any time—will yield one shadow of the inalienable right of the Sovereign Pontiffs to the Capital of Christendom; nor will it for a moment suffer the denial of its own supreme right and duty to intervene for the protection to the Holy See. The moral cordon of justice and order will be always drawn around it; and the right of execution will never depart from the Catholic world. In the days of Pius IX. it is France alone which has executed the will of Christendom; in the days of his successor it may be a league of Catholic Powers, or the force of two hundred millions concentrated and brought to bear by some future organization which shall give expression and effect to their will.

"For twenty years the anti-Christian seditious of all the world have aimed at the overthrow of Rome, at the destruction of the Temporal Power first, of the Spiritual Power afterwards. They hate the Temporal Power much, but they hate the Spiritual Power more. They think that if it were possible to destroy the Temporal Power, the Pontiffs would be either persecuted or subject. *A Pope subject to a Royal Supremacy would reduce the Spiritual Supremacy to absurdity;* and derision would be a keener and more deadly weapon against Christianity than persecution. For this end, therefore, all the spirits of anti-Christian revolution have united against Rome. They have poisoned the public opinion of Europe against it by lying, or by truths perverted, which are the worst of lies. They have misled and influenced Governments, stirred up popular bigotry, painted the Government of Rome in the darkest and falsest colours, organized in secret a propaganda of sedition to disgust, alienate, and goad on the subjects of the Holy See to discontent and to rebellion. Finally, when the people of Rome would not rebel, nor accept them as deliverers, nor take the bait of sedition, the revolutionary hordes of all countries entered the Roman State in arms. It was at once proclaimed as the rising and insurrection of the Roman State. Foreign invasion played the part of domestic insurrection. Every act to seduce or to compel the peaceful population to rise has been used. Provisional Governments, revolutionary committees, petitions signed by imaginary thousands, plebiscites, proclamations, conspiracies in Rome, shells thrown among the loyal inhabitants, gunpowder plots, mines under the walls—all has been tried, but all in vain. In the end, moved by a just indignation, delayed, through Christian endurance, only too long, the soldiers and protectors of the Holy See crushed and scattered the lawless bands of the revolution. It was a just and noble act for the Catholics of all countries to sweep the seditious, conspiracies, and armed outrages of foreign invaders out of the patrimony of the Church. *If the unbelievers of other countries, banded in secret societies, have a right to plot the overthrow of the Sovereign Pontiff, the faithful of other nations have likewise a just and perfect right, in open and lawful array, to defend his person and his throne.* If the revolution invade his State, the Catholic world has a right to turn it out. Foreign aggressors may justly be destroyed by foreign



troops. *And yet no Catholic power is foreign in Rome.* Every Catholic has a right in the Holy See, and in the city where God has placed it. The theory of non-intervention has no application in this case. Non-intervention may be a policy of the natural order ; but it must be confined to the sphere of politics, and to the mutual respect of civil Governments. When applied to Rome, it is a mere deceit, in order to mask the question. *No Catholic Power can proclaim the policy of non-intervention when the Vicar of Christ and the Head of the Catholic Church is threatened. To do so would be to renounce the Catholic character and name.* Protestant or schismatical Governments may, perhaps, proclaim non-intervention as their policy, because they have forfeited their rights in Rome. They may also in their theories divide the Temporal from the Spiritual Power of the Pontiffs. But all Catholics know these things to be providentially united for the free and peaceful exercise of the mission of the Church among the nations of the world. The intervention of the French people to defend the person and authority of Pius IX. against external violence, *from whatsoever nation, race, or Government it may come*, would be, by all the prescriptions of Christian international law, an honourable, just, and noble act. How much more, when France has intervened against a lawless and immoral band of invaders, rebels to their own Government, and disturbers of the peace of the Christian world (pp. 10-13).

"The late events have detected and exposed with a terrible but just retribution the hollowness, the imposture, the falsehood, the vainglory, the impotence of the Revolution. Grandiloquence, mystery, pretended ubiquity, for a long time terrified or distracted the friends of order. But the veil is rent, and the idol is broken. On the 1st of November the ringleader of this godless anarchy proclaimed to the world from Monte Rotondo :—'I here, alone, a Roman general, with full powers from the only lawful Government—that is, of the Roman Republic and elected by universal suffrage—have the right to maintain myself in arms on this territory of my jurisdiction.' Before the moon was up on the night of the 3rd, he and his hordes were swept away, not by the soldiers of Christendom, nor by the armies of France, but by the just judgment of God, Whom, in the Vicar of His incarnate Son, he had outraged and defied.

"Thus, then, is one vast scandal and danger swept out of Italy. Year by year there have been arising in Italy the harbingers of a better day. It has suffered much, and the shadow of a greater suffering which may yet come, is cast before upon it. But there is yet time, and there is yet hope. Italy is both Christian and Catholic. Infidelity and revolution have tormented and tainted Italy, but Italy is neither revolutionary nor infidel. Factions have risen, from time to time, to the surface ; and the traditional mind and will of Italy is for a while confused and paralysed. But it is evidently rising again in vigour and control ; and if only wise and Christian counsels prevail, the Christian mind of Italy will be once more in the ascendant. Then, and only then, can the reconciliation of Italy and Rome be accomplished. No worse enemy ever came between them than the Infidel revolution. When Italy returns upon the path of its old Catholic glories, the heart of the Catholic world will return to it. We love and venerate it as the soil on which the greatest glories of the Catholic Church are inscribed, and the Head of the Christian world is divinely placed. Apart from these prerogatives, Italy has no claim upon our goodwill beyond other nations ; *against these supreme laws of Providence Italy has no rights.* We pray that all temporal prosperity may be upon her, but on condition of her fidelity to the order and unity of the Christian world" (pp. 14-16).

*Essays on Religion and Literature.* By various writers. Edited by ARCHBISHOP MANNING. Second Series. London: Longman.

WE hail this volume for various reasons with peculiar pleasure; and on no other ground more, than because it affords the welcome spectacle of priests and laymen combining in defence and exposition of Catholic doctrine, under the direct supervision of ecclesiastical authority. Canon Oakeley and Mr. Wilberforce, Father Christie and Mr. Lucas, are, in their respective essays, travelling over the same ground and discussing or establishing the same principles; while Mr. Purcell's essay is really an elaborate development of one portion of the Inaugural Address of the Archbishop.

That Inaugural Address is in continuation of the one published in the first series, and is, no doubt, the authoritative definition of the purpose for which the Academia exists. But, apart from this—its apparent object—the Essay deserves to be read in another light. It points out a certain course of conduct for all who come in contact with heretics, and is replete with that wisdom which is the peculiar possession of the Church. Here is one sentence, which in our opinion is one of the most important that has been uttered for some time. "Every year the doctrine of invincible ignorance has a narrower application to the people of England" (p. 16); though for ourselves we do not at all doubt that it still very widely exists.

The Essay of the Archbishop on the Inspiration of Scripture is extremely valuable for the history of the controversy and for the clear way in which that question is stated. To discuss that matter with heretics on their principles is labour lost, just as it is to discuss with them the interpretation of the difficult texts—and all texts may be made difficult by disputation. The Archbishop therefore treats it as a Catholic. And we hear him with pleasure saying that "inspired" is really and practically to all the faithful synonymous with canonical; *i. e.*, the inspired books are the books which the Church holds sacred, and in the form in which she holds them.

We have an Essay on the mission and prospects of the Catholic Church in England, by that graceful and accomplished writer, Canon Oakeley, who prosecutes with his usual ability and honesty of purpose the question he had previously raised in the former series. And as Mr. Wilberforce's interesting and exact essay also is really occupied with the same subject, we shall discuss them together. The Canon looks forward and shows the dangers of the future, while Mr. Wilberforce is hinting at a like result by pointing out how the evil was wrought in times past. The learned layman has traced the loss of the Faith in this country to certain causes, while the priest, as a preacher, warns us against cognate risks likely to mar the blessings of a partial recovery of that Faith. The mission of the Church which Mr. Oakeley discusses, is the very thing which Mr. Wilberforce shows us in the process of being ruined. The two essays should be read together, and treated as one, by those who would really understand what is going on.

The same observation applies also to the grave and thoughtful essays of F. Christie and Mr. Lucas. They form something in the nature of

"evidences," though not precisely of that character. In the former we trace a line of thought with which F. Christie, as his friends are well aware, has been long familiar, and which he has deeply pondered, so as to become master of it. Father Christie speaks very distinctly on the questions he treats, and leaves no room for missing or even perverting his meaning. This, of course, is nothing unusual with him ; but as in these days so many write vaguely, it is refreshing for his readers to listen to a voice which is not uncertain. He insists more than once that a teacher is more important than a book, and by consequence the matter of a revelation must, he tells us, become obscured without the definite instructions of a living and accessible master who cannot err : in other words, the Christian religion was not meant to exist, as in fact it does not, without the Pope.

"As to the meaning of that Revelation and the truths it teaches, they [heretics] refuse to recognize the living voice of an infallible teacher. . . . It must issue in the opinion that, while it has been proved that a revelation has been made, there is, notwithstanding, nothing to determine the details of the revelation, or, in other words, that, while Christianity is true, there is no certainty as to what Christianity teaches" (p. 294).

That is it ; the absence of the teacher renders the lesson vague, doubtful, and null, and the learners learn that which is worse than nothing. We see it before us every day of our lives ; multitudes there are of men and women who have a rather firm persuasion, on the whole, that the Christian religion is true, and every other religion false, but who at the same time hold not one single dogma ; still less hold any dogma so thoroughly, as to be able to make it clear to others that they do hold it at all, even if they profess to hold it. Mr. Lucas in his essay continues that discussion, the first parts of which we had in the previous series of these papers of the *Academia*. He prosecutes his task with a carefulness and patience beyond all praise ; clearing away obscurities, removing difficulties, answering objections, and, finally, building up his superstructure upon the most solid possible foundation. Moreover, it is a work that he really loves ; over which he has long pondered ; and for which he is unquestionably qualified, by the power and clearness of his thought, the earnestness of his manner, and the deep sincerity of his convictions. His thesis may be described thus : Christianity is not a system of philosophy.

Mr. Purcell's Essay on Church and State is another valuable contribution at the present day. It is a calm and thoughtful exposure of the popular notion, that one and the same man can safely contradict himself. A private person is generally expected to live decently, consistently with his avowed principles : but he who becomes a Minister of State is allowed to do things in that capacity utterly at variance with his known convictions and obligations ; even those which, he confesses himself, bind him as a private person. It was on this theory that certain Catholics in the English Parliament voted for the Divorce Bill ; though they knew that divorce, followed by a pretended marriage as Parliament meant it to be, is a mortal sin. Men in office, though Christians, break the Christian law as officials, though they do not like to do so as private persons. In the eleventh century there is an example of this in the person of a nobleman, an Archbishop of Rouen, who

was Count of Evreux ; in the latter character he became a public scandal by marrying a wife : *conjugem . . . ut comes, habuit* : that is, he was careful not to marry as a bishop.\* If kings and their ministers were consistent Catholics, there never could arise the smallest difficulty between Church and State : but, as statesmen and official persons have a mania for meddling with matters over which they have no control, there is nothing but trouble and confusion in the world. Even in the kingdom of Belgium, where Church and State are severed, and where it is publicly held that neither has any business with the other, the servants of the State are constantly making ingenious and daring efforts to enter the sanctuary out of which they are voluntary exiles. Mr. Purcell in his admirable essay points out how the consistent profession of Christian Truth secures the union of Church and State, and necessarily issues in it ; and, moreover, that such a union, so arrived at, conserves the supremacy of the Church, while the State thrives unconscious of any restraint. It is only when men want to break the commandments, that they find out a tyrant or oppressor in the Church their mother.

"Remarks on the value of certain sacrificial words used by S. Paul" is the title of a very able and deeply interesting essay contributed by Monsignore Patterson. The learned writer discusses with great felicity the meaning of certain expressions of S. Paul, which in the Church have ever been regarded as indications of, or allusions to, the Mass. It is a very valuable paper ; and is another proof, if proof were wanting, that a "Bible without note or comment" would be one of the most grievous calamities to which the human race could be exposed.

Dr. Ward's two essays were first published five or six years ago, and were vigorously criticised by F. Roberts in the final number of the "Rambler." Dr. Ward rejoined, and the controversy ended by a published correspondence between the two. On looking again at the essays after an interval, we are greatly disappointed at the inadequate justice done by them to what we must be allowed to consider their very important theme : a theme indeed of peculiar moment in this age of intellectual restlessness and of intellect-idolatry. We will here briefly reply to two criticisms which have been made on these essays, since their publication in the present volume.

Firstly, it has been said that Dr. Ward must have had a very low appreciation of his hearers' mental capacity, when he took so much trouble in explaining the very simple notion conveyed in the word "intellect." But in fact it was absolutely necessary for his argument to urge that the word "intellect," in its popular and every-day use, has a totally different sense from that which it bears in theology and psychology. If this had not been made plain, various theological testimonies might very plausibly have been alleged against him, which are in truth totally irrelevant.

Secondly, it has been objected that at last it is very difficult to apprehend what Dr. Ward's precise thesis is. No doubt he might have made this much clearer, if his power had been greater of distinct and forcible exposition ; yet the following passage from his second essay is surely explicit enough.

---

\* Gallia Christian. xi. 27.

"Everything is more *perfect* in proportion as it more nearly *reaches its proper end* ; or, to put the same thing in other words, in proportion as it more completely *accomplishes its proper work*, its *ἔργον* as Aristotle would say. A locomotive engine is more perfect, in proportion as it more combines strength, speed, and safety : the art of medicine is more perfect, in proportion as it enables the student more successfully to cure disease. And my proposition is this. Our body is more perfect, in proportion as we more combine health, strength, speed, and the rest. Our poetical faculty is more perfect, in proportion as we possess a keener power of appreciating poetical beauty. Our practical faculty is more perfect, in proportion as we possess genius and fertility of resource, for devising and carrying out plans of practical action. Our intellect is more perfect, in proportion as we have a greater power (to use F. Newman's words) of grasping a large multitude of objects in their mutual and true relations. But we, as *persons*, as *men*, are more perfect,—have more nearly achieved our proper end, have more completely accomplished our proper work,—exclusively in proportion as we are more *morally and spiritually perfect*. This surely is a most definite and intelligible statement, whether you agree with it or no. And I maintain that no different statement can be made on the subject, consistently with Catholic doctrine."

This is Dr. Ward's main point. No man is more deserving of respect, either on account of intellectual power or intellectual cultivation as such, than he is on account of bodily power or muscular development. He is more deserving of respect, in proportion as he more faithfully accomplishes his proper work ; and he more faithfully accomplishes his proper work, in proportion as he is more morally and spiritually excellent. Those who are called to an intellectual life, more nearly reach the end of their existence, in proportion as they more consistently make their intellectual exercises an instrument of moral and spiritual perfection.

It is of course in no way inconsistent with this, to urge that intellect can do most important service to religion and the Church ; and that those whom God has gifted with great intellectual power, will ordinarily best please God by improving that power to the uttermost, with the view of more effectually forwarding His work on earth.

In forthcoming volumes we hope we may find some of those questions discussed, which the Archbishop in his address commends to the Academia.

---

*L'Ermesianismo.* Per il PADRE PERRONE. Roma.

OUR purpose in noticing this Essay of F. Perrone's, written several years back, is to show (1) the fundamentally *philosophical* character of Hermes's errors ; (2) the distinct claim of infallibility put forth by Gregory XVI. for his condemnation of Hermes ; and (3) F. Perrone's hearty advocacy of that claim.

Firstly then, that Hermes's errors were fundamentally philosophical, is evident from Gregory XVI.'s Brief ; part of which is recited by Denzinger, nn. 1486-7. The Pontiff accounts Hermes among those who profess to contend for religion, "in order that, while retaining the appearance of religion but despising the Truth, they may the more easily seduce and pervert the unwary by means of '*philosophy*,' i.e. through their vain philo-

*sophical imaginings* 'and foolish deceitfulness' (Col. ii. 8). Hermes in particular, says the Holy Father, "devises a dark road to error of every kind, (1) in making 'positive doubt' the basis of all theological inquiry; and (2) in the principle which he lays down, that reason is the chief norm and the only method whereby man may arrive at a knowledge of supernatural truths."\* The foundation then of Hermes's errors was purely philosophical. It may be added also that the unsound superstructure, erected on that foundation, contained and condemned one or two constituents, which were philosophical rather than theological; such as "the motives of credibility," and "the arguments whereby the existence of God has ordinarily been asserted and confirmed." Gregory XVI. ends by "condemning and reprobating" Hermes's books, and "exhorting in the Lord" all Catholic bishops to "turn aside their flocks with all care and solicitude from such poisoned pastures."†

This Brief is dated Sep. 26, 1835. The Hermesians denied that Hermes had ever taught those two philosophical principles, which were denounced by the Holy See as the foundation of his system. As to the other heads recited in the Brief, they complained earnestly that the Pontiff had not specified those particular errors, under each respective head, into which he considered Hermes to have fallen: but they professed themselves ready to receive humbly such true doctrine on those heads, as the Holy See might vouchsafe to impart. The reply given through Card. Lambruschini, by Gregory XVI.'s command, was most express (Perrone, pp. 28-9).

"There is no need of a profession of faith to be proposed by the Holy Father. It will suffice if you submit yourselves *in heart and mind with all due obedience* to that judgment of the Holy See, whereby Hermes's writings were condemned; reprobating those things which were *reprobated by the Chair of Peter*: and if you do nothing at any future time, whereby you turn aside from this *indubitable path of verity*."‡

Here it is said, almost in so many words, that Hermes's condemnation was

---

\* "Inter hujusmodi erroris magistros . . . adnumeratur Georgius Hermes, utpote qui . . . tenebrosam ad errorem omnigenum viam molitur, in dubio positivo tanquam basi omnis theologicæ inquisitionis, et in principio quod statuit rationem principem normam ac unicum medium esse quo homo assequi possit supernaturalium veritatum cognitionem."

In an earlier passage of the Brief occur these words:—"Quapropter, ut nobis impiæ et insidiosæ quorundam horum scriptorum molitiones innotuerunt, non distulimus *per nostras Encyclicas aliasque Apostolicas Litteras callida eorum et prava denunciare consilia erroresque damnare*." To condemn nascent errors is plainly to speak *ex cathedrâ*: and Gregory XVI. therefore declares himself to have spoken *ex cathedrâ* in various Encyclicals and other Apostolic Letters.

† Here is another instance of what we have said more than once; viz., that a Pontifical Act is very often *intended* for the Universal Church, without being *formally* so addressed.

‡ "Non novâ opus est fidei professione quæ à Sanctissimo Patre proferatur: sat erit ut quâ par est obedientiâ S. Sedis judicio, quo Hermesii scripta fuerunt damnata, corde et animo vosmetipsos subjiciatis, ea reprobantes quæ à Petri Cathedrâ fuerunt reprobata; nihilque unquam præstetis, quo ab indubio hoc veritatis tramite deflectatis."



ex cathedrâ (à *Petri Cathedrâ* reprobata): and adhesion to this Chair is called "the *indubitable* path of verity."

On this, a memorial was addressed to Card. Lambruschini by two Hermesian Professors, who had come to Rome on the subject. They said they did not distinctly understand the reply they had received. They were quite ready to "reprobate" Hermes's works, in the sense of promising most faithfully never to use those works in teaching; and they were prepared to disavow heartily the two philosophical principles, ascribed to Hermes by Gregory XVI. But their conscience forbade them to admit that Hermes had ever upholden those principles; nor were they aware that he had ever taught false doctrine on the various heads mentioned in the Brief. F. Perrone inserts this memorial textually from p. 27 to p. 32; and we give entire Cardinal Lambruschini's reply. Our readers will be struck by its peremptoriness.

"I answer without delay to your letter of April 4th. On a matter which is of all the most momentous (for the question is concerning purity of faith, than which nothing can be more precious to a Catholic) the charity of Christ, the nature of my office, require that I speak to you openly.

"I will say therefore, that it is clear from your letter that, having entered on the path of error, you are following the footsteps of men in error. The words in which I had explained to you the Holy Father's mind in my letter of Aug. 5th are so plain, as not to permit even the slightest opening for doubt as to their sense. But so far are you from having done *what was required of you by the Holy See*, that, on the contrary, you are inflicting a *grave outrage on the authority of that See* by taking refuge in that futile distinction between *jus* and *factum*, which was devised by the Jansenists; by denying, in virtue of that distinction, that the errors condemned by the Holy See in Hermes's writings, are found therein; by refusing to submit yourselves to *that judgment of the Holy See*, whereby Hermes's writings were condemned, and to reprobate purely and simply those things—that is, all and each of those things—which were *reprobated by the Chair of Peter*.

"After this it will be quite useless to send me any further letter on the subject; for, since the *judgment of the Holy See remains firm and unshaken*, 'the cause is at an end; would that the error were ended likewise!'

"As to the writings you have sent me,—I have not only not read them, I have not even opened them. You will find them attached to this letter.

"Nothing else remains than to pour forth earnest prayers to God, that He may enlighten your minds with the heavenly light of His grace, in order that you may know that 'the kingdom of God is *in the simplicity of faith*, not in contention of speech;' and [to pray] that in His mercy He may give you that spirit of *humility* whereby 'you may bring your *intellect* into captivity to the *obedience of Christ*;' and that you be not as children," &c. &c.\*

---

\* "Illustrissimi Domini.—Literis quas ad me dedistis die quartâ Aprilis, nulla interposita mora paucis respondeo.

"In re quæ omnium maximi momenti est (agitur enim de fidei puritate quâ nil pretiosius viro Catholico esse potest) id Christi charitas, id officii mei ratio postulat, ut vobis, Illustrissimi Domini, aperte loquar.

"Dicam itaque ex vestris literis apparere vos, erroris viam ingressos, errantium vestigia sectari. Verba quibus meis literis die 5 Augusti ad vos datis Sanctissimi Patris mentem vobis aperueram, manifesta ita sunt, ut ne levissimam quidem de eorum sensu ambigendi occasionem præberent. At tantum abest ut id quod Sanctitatis Suse nomine vobis fuerat denunciatum



Hermes's condemnation, as has been seen, was for errors fundamentally philosophical; and it was published, not in a Dogmatical Bull, but in a Brief. The Cardinal however, writing as Gregory XVI.'s representative, accounts it "the firm and unshaken judgment of the Holy See;" pronounced ex "cathedrâ;" equal in authority to the earlier condemnation of Jansenius; nay, also of Pelagius, for his quotation from S. Augustine refers to the latter.

F. Perrone quotes all this with the warmest concurrence. He speaks (p. 16) of Gregory XVI.'s Brief as "*the oracle of the Holy See*," and equals its authority to that of Fénelon's condemnation.\* But no one will doubt that F. Perrone regards the latter as infallible; and the conclusion is obvious.

---

*Divi Augustini de origine et cognitionis intellectualis doctrina ab Ontologism nota vindicta, Commentatio Philosophica. Auctore, N. L. SCHÜTZ, Presb. Diœc. Treveren.*

**H**ERR SCHÜTZ, a priest of the diocese of Trèves, has published as a thesis for his degree in philosophy a tract which deserves to be better known. It is written against the ontologistic system, and is intended to prove that that system is not that of S. Augustine. His account of its characteristic tenets is as follows:—

---

præstiteritis, quin potius gravem Apostolicæ Sedis auctoritati injuriam irrogastis, ad inanem juris et facti distinctionem a Jansenistis excogitatum confugientes, eâque innixi, errores à S. Sede in Hermesii scriptis damnatos in iisdem inveniri denegantes, detrectantesque S. Sedis judicio, quo Hermesii scripta fuerunt damnata, vosmetipsos subjicere atque ea, id est omnia et singula pure et simpliciter reprobare, quæ a Petri Cathedra fuerunt reprobata.

"Post hæc inutile prorsus erit ut alias ad me hanc circa rem literas detis; cum enim firmum inconcussumque S. Sedis judicium maneat, 'causa finita est, utinam aliquando finiatur et error!'

"Scripta quæ ad me misistis nedum legi, sed nec evolvi quidem; ea hisce adnexa literis invenietis.

"Nil aliud mihi superest, nisi ut enixas ad Deum preces fundam, ut supremo mentes vestras gratiæ suæ lumine illustret ut cognoscatis 'regnum Dei in simplicitate fidei esse non in contentione sermonis,' eumque vobis pro Sua clementia, humilitatis spiritum largiatur, quo 'in captivitatem redigatis intellectum in obsequium Christi, ne sitis parvuli fluctuantes, et circumferamini omni vento doctrinæ,' neque vobismetipsis placentes unitatis dissidio Christi Ecclesiam scindatis."

"Interim sincero existimationis sensu permaneo.

"Romæ ex Palatio Quirinali die 6 Aprilis 1838.

"Dominationum vestrarum

"Ad serviendum paratissimus  
"ALOISIUS CARD. LAMBRUSCHINI."

\* He is speaking (p. 16) on the unwillingness of the Hermesians to submit interiorly to their condemnation. He explains this by saying that "Fénelon's magnanimity and greatness of soul are to be found in very few;" and that the Hermesians were compelled to choose between "full submission to the Pontifical Decree" and "the point of honour" involved in upholding their teacher.

1. "The knowledge which the human mind possesses of God in this life proceeds from God Himself presented immediately and directly to the soul. The idea of God is neither something intermediate between God and the soul, i. e., an idea held before the soul by Him, nor a modification of the soul, but God Himself.

2. "As God's Essence cannot be seen in this life, He can only appear to the soul under some of His Attributes, which are indeed identical with Him, but which can be seen apart from His Essence, as being virtually distinct from it.

3. "If the human mind is capable of arriving at truth at all, it must know things as they are in reality; therefore it must know them as proceeding from God, and *the order of knowledge must also be the order of existence*. This immediate knowledge of God then must be the first in order of all our knowledge. *He Himself is the first object known*. This knowledge is possessed by all men at least in confuso and is implicitly at least the source of our knowledge of all other objects."

This third, we believe, would be accounted by ordinary ontologists as their fundamental tenet.\*

We recommend to our readers the whole essay, for its brief account of the opinions in question; for its able refutation of the claim of the ontologist school to represent S. Augustine; and for the moderation of its tone. The author states clearly what is ontologism; and he does not confound with it every conceivable doctrine, involving the existence of a faculty of intuition; which on the contrary he himself holds. He asserts "that S. Augustine claims for our mind a certain intuition, and that direct and immediate"; and that he refers such intuition to the fact that God "has added, to the faculty of

---

\* In our number for October, 1865 (p. 474), we desiderated "the establishment of some concordat between ontologism and psychologism:" but we are now entirely convinced (partly by some recent articles in the *Civiltà*) that the former system is absolutely condemned by the Church.

The following seven propositions were condemned by the Holy Office on September 18th, 1861; and their condemnation has been implicitly confirmed by the Holy Father, in that censure of Prof. Ubaghs's philosophy which we treat in a separate notice.

I. Immediata Dei cognitio, habitualis saltem, intellectui humano essentialis est, ita ut sine eâ nihil cognoscere possit: siquidem est ipsum lumen intellectuale.

II. Esse illud, quod in omnibus et sine quo nihil intelligimus, est Esse Divinum.

III. Universalia, à parte rei considerata, a Deo realiter non distinguuntur.

IV. Congenita Dei tamquam Entis simpliciter notitia omnem aliam cognitionem eminenti modo involvit, ita ut per eam omne ens, sub quocumque respectu cognoscibile est, implicite cognitum habeamus.

V. Omnes alie idee non sunt nisi modificationes idee, quâ Deus tamquam ens simpliciter intelligitur.

VI. Res creatæ sunt in Deo tamquam pars in toto: non quidem in toto formali, sed in toto infinito, simplicissimo; quod suas quasi partes absque ullâ sui divisione et diminutione extra se ponit.

VII. Creatio sic explicari potest: Deus ipso actu speciali quo se intelligit et vult tamquam distinctum a determinatâ creaturâ, homine v. g., creaturam producit.

knowing, an intellectual light, wherein are contained the principia per se nota both of the speculative and of the practical intellect."

In fact, it seems excessively difficult to deny to the human mind an intuitive perception of some truths, after the declarations of S. Thomas in his Summa that "we know first principles by simple intuition (intuitu)," (2, 2, 180, a 6, ad 2); and that "the first principles both of things speculative and practical are naturally implanted (indita) in us without the investigation of reason" (1, 79, ad 12). Passing to the 19th century, F. Ravignan speaks generally of these first principles or first truths. He refers to man's "*first notions* of being, of the true, of the good, of the just": and says that God Himself "enlightens every man coming into the world by *giving him*" those "*first ideas*." "If you do not admit this principle," he adds, "you will have effects without causes and results without a beginning" (Conférence 14<sup>me</sup>, pp. 385, 6). And still more expressly in the next page. "There are . . . *truths of intuition*, there are also truths of reasoning and deduction; and both kinds—the truths of intuition and the truths of deduction—are equally found as well in that order [of things] which is ideal or purely intellectual, as in that which is experimental or sensible." But in fact Pius IX. speaks expressly on this subject. He often refers in his Acts to the "*idea ingenita boni et aequi*"; and in the Encyclical "*Quanto conficiamur*" of August 10th, 1863, he refers to "the precepts of the natural law" as having been "*engraven by God (insculpta à Deo) on the hearts of all*."

Without committing ourselves to every single proposition expressed by Herr Schütz, on the whole we heartily recommend his pamphlet to our readers.

---

*Acta ex iis decerpta quæ apud Sanctam Sedem geruntur.* Oct., 1867. Roma: Mariotti.

WE cordially recommend this most useful monthly compilation to all those who wish to be "*au courant*" with the various documents issued for the Church's benefit by her supreme authorities. We notice this particular number, because it contains certain Roman documents, connected with a recent philosophical controversy in Belgium, which are calculated to throw important light on more than one theological question of the day. We have thought it for many reasons more satisfactory to reprint the whole of these documents at the end of our present number; and we beg that our readers will check and correct all our remarks by an examination of the documents themselves.

Professor Ubaghs is the principal writer condemned. The more prominent errors censured in him are these two: viz. (1) his not giving due weight to the *à posteriori* arguments for God's Existence; and (2) his modified advocacy of traditionalism. But he is further reproved for his statements concerning ontologism, traducianism, and the vital principle in man.

Now these various philosophical tenets are not directly contradictory to the Deposit, nor yet do they lead to such contradiction by necessary logical consequence. Accordingly they are not condemned as "*heretical*," nor again

as "erroneous"; but as "dangerous" and "unsafe." Of certain ontologic tenets, the Holy Office (see our previous notice) declared that "they cannot be *safely* taught"; and the Holy Father, in condemning Prof. Ubaghs, expressed implicitly his confirmation of that decree. He further confirmed in its integrity the Congregational declaration, that various opinions of Prof. Ubaghs "cannot be taught *without peril*." "*Peril*" to *what*? "*safely*," in reference to *what*? Of course, in reference to security of the Deposit and the well-being of souls.

Let us recount the successive stages of this history. The first intervention of authority was as early as June 3, 1843. On that day the Congregation of the Index issued a decree, pointing out various errors in Prof. Ubaghs's "Theodicea" and "Logic," and requiring him to correct them in a new edition. These errors denied the possibility of "demonstrating" (in the proper sense of that word) "external metaphysical truths" in general, and God's Existence in particular. The changes, however, which he made in consequence of this censure, by no means satisfied the exigences of the case; and a second decree therefore was issued on Aug. 8, 1844, to the same general effect with the former. It appears from a later document (Cardinal Patrizi's letter of Oct. 11, 1864) that both these decrees were confirmed by Gregory XVI.; but it is carefully to be observed, that this confirmation was not expressed in the decrees themselves.

During the sixteen years which followed, there was doubtless a large amount of eager controversy; but no official steps seem to have been taken on the matter. In the year 1860, however, four professors of Louvain University, including Prof. Ubaghs, wrote a letter, dated Feb. 1st, expressing their doctrine on traditionalism, and addressed it to Cardinal de Andrea, who was then Prefect of the Congregation of the Index. He did not confer with his colleagues; but having consulted certain theologians, he returned an answer on his own account; praising the professors for their submission to the Apostolic See, and declaring that the doctrine referred to him "is among those questions which may be freely disputed on either side by Christian philosophers." This letter however, very naturally, in no way tended to terminate the controversy, but rather embroiled matters further: for it was the Cardinal's private letter, and did not even profess to be from the Congregation. On July 31, 1861, the Belgian bishops addressed the Rector of the University with a view of promoting tranquillity; but when they failed in this, certain of their number besought the Holy See to pronounce on the question. To this request the Holy Father replied in an Apostolical Letter, dated Dec. 19, 1861, from which we have more than once given extracts in this REVIEW. He declared in this letter that "the definitive examination and judgment of these doctrines appertain exclusively to the Apostolic See"; and that until such judgment should be given, neither party was to allege its own doctrine as the only permissible doctrine. He also disavowed Cardinal de Andrea's letter as of no authority whatever.

The Pontiff then commissioned the united Congregations of the Inquisition and Index to examine the whole matter; and on Oct. 11, 1863, Cardinal Patrizi wrote to the Belgian bishops, announcing the result. The united Congregations declared (1) that in his later editions Prof. Ubaghs had not

really corrected the errors censured in 1843 and 1844. They therefore (2) commanded him to do so. (3) They were careful to explain that they must not be understood as approving certain other tenets advocated in the more recent editions of his works. And (4) they stated that the Holy Father confirmed their decree.

In 1865, therefore, Prof. Ubaghs prepared a new edition of his works ; but some of the bishops thought that he had still not made the requisite corrections. The same united Council therefore, as before, assembled in Rome, and a new decree was issued, bearing date March 2, 1866. This decree ruled (1) that the new edition still contained in substance the condemned errors ; (2) that the more recent editions of his works contained [ontologistic] opinions similar to some of the seven condemned by the Holy Office on Sept. 17, 1861; and (3) that other opinions were there to be found, at least incautiously expressed, concerning traducianism and the vital principle in man. The two Congregations therefore pronounced their judgment : "that in the philosophical works published by G. C. Ubaghs, and especially in his 'Logic' and 'Theodicea,' doctrines or opinions are found which cannot be taught without danger." They added that this judgment had been "confirmed" by "the supreme authority" of the Holy Father.

On receiving this decree, some of the Louvain professors said that it did not condemn—and that neither did any previous decree condemn—the letter written to Cardinal de Andrea by the four professors, on February 1, 1860. On this being made known at Rome, a reply came promptly from Cardinal Patrizi, dated June 3, 1866, declaring that this was a mistaken interpretation, and desiring the bishops to obtain from the condemned writers a "perfect and absolute submission to the resolution of the Holy See."

The condemned writers did not even yet thoroughly understand their position. Professor Ubaghs indeed, by desire of the bishops, vacated his chair. Moreover, Professors Beelen and Lefebvre declared to the assembled bishops, that they would carefully abstain from *teaching* the opinions which they had expressed on February 1, 1860, "condemning the development of human reason;" but they added that they saw no conclusive reasons for believing that these opinions had been "*doctrinally*" condemned. They professed, at the same time, their firm resolve of submitting interiorly to any *doctrinal* decree of the Holy See which should be duly authenticated, and they wrote out a distinct exposition of their opinion to be placed before the Roman authorities. Their letter ended thus: "It will be most acceptable to be taught by the Apostolic See, whether those statements which we have expressed have been *theologically* condemned by that See, and therefore *are to be absolutely rejected by every Catholic.*"

The bishops, in forwarding this exposition to Rome, added a letter of their own to the Holy Father, dated August 1, 1866. Some, they said, were still of opinion that the letter of February 1, 1860, was not included at all in the condemnation. Others, that it was condemned indeed, but that such condemnation was disciplinary and not doctrinal. "We must not *teach* the condemned opinion,"—such was the language of these men,—"*but we may preserve it in our heart.*" The bishops ended by entreating the Pontiff to declare whether the said exposition, of February 1, 1860, "were really repro-

bated in the above-named declarations?" Cardinal Patrizi promptly replied in the Pontiff's name (August 30), that it was wonderful how such doubts as those mentioned could possibly be entertained; and that of course the exposition of February, 1860, had been fully taken into account. In conclusion he urged the bishops to "exhort" men "more and more to acquiesce ex animo, as becomes them, in the judgment of the Apostolic See."

The bishops on this drew up on December 17 a form of submission, to be signed by all the Louvain professors, than which nothing could be more explicit. It included the following words: "I fully, perfectly, and absolutely submit myself to the *decisions of the Holy Apostolic See*, dated March 7, and August 30, of this year. And therefore from my heart I reprobate and reject every opposite doctrine; in particular that exposition of doctrine, which was subscribed by four professors in February, 1860." All the Louvain professors signed this, and so the matter was brought to a close.

It will have been observed that Cardinal Patrizi, writing in the Pope's name on August 30, 1866, calls certain declarations "the decrees of the Holy See," "the judgment of the Holy See." What are these declarations? His own letter explains: they are "the responses of the sacred Congregations of the Inquisition and the Index, confirmed by the authority of the Supreme Pontiff;" and, we may add, themselves expressing that confirmation. Again, the final formula of submission includes this very letter of Cardinal Patrizi's, written "in the name of the Holy Father," among the "decisions of the Holy Apostolic See." On the other hand, this phrase is nowhere applied to the congregational decrees of 1843 and 1844, which do not *express* their own confirmation by the Pope, although in fact Gregory XVI. did confirm them. Again, Professors Ubaghs and Lefebvre frankly declare that if their opinion on the development of human reason has been "theologically" condemned in the later "decision," "every Catholic" is under the obligation of "entirely rejecting" it, and not merely of not teaching it. It was accepted then throughout as a matter of course by all concerned in the controversy, (1) that congregational declarations of doctrine which express their own confirmation by the Pope are equivalent Pontifical decrees; and (2) that the Pontiff's doctrinal decrees, on matters primarily philosophical, demand the Catholic's interior assent.

Other important inferences may be drawn from this history, which will from time to time occupy our attention.

---

*The Inner Life of the Very Reverend Père Lacordaire, of the Order of Preachers.* Translated from the French of the Rev. Père CHOCARNE, O.P., by a Religious of the same Order. William B. Kelley. Dublin.

**F.** CHOCARNE'S book is one worthy to take its place in a literature richer than any other in biographies. Many of our readers, no doubt, have made acquaintance with the original. Its appearance in English will however secure it currency amongst a greatly enlarged circle of readers, both of those who are able and those who are unable to enjoy it in the French.

The translation, if it does not possess that excellence of the very highest order which makes us forget that what we read was written in a foreign idiom, is certainly well done and reads easily.

The book is sure to be perused with eagerness. F. Lacordaire's great gifts, the work he has accomplished, and the prominent place he has occupied in French ecclesiastical affairs during a period of unrivalled importance, are sure to give a vivid interest to a work which offers a glimpse at least of the "inner," of the more secret life of such a man. If, therefore, we make two or three remarks before leaving the book, it will be with a view not so much to recommend it to our readers, as to direct attention to one or two special points. F. Lacordaire was converted to the Christian Faith, as is generally known, at the age of two-and-twenty, when an Advocate at the Paris Bar. Yet his childhood bore an extraordinary stamp of earnest faith and precocious piety. He not only, like so many pious children, delighted to imitate the priestly functions at the altar, but his little heart was fired with a real zeal for God. "He preached to everybody who came, but particularly to his nurse, who was his most willing listener . . . and in fact he would preach with so much force and vehemence that the nurse was sometimes terrified, and claspings her hands she would exclaim, 'But, Master Henry, that's enough; you will do yourself harm! Don't make yourself so hot!' 'No, no,' he would reply, 'people commit too many sins. It is no matter being tired: I could preach for ever.' And then he would recommence his tirades on the decay of faith and the loss of morals" (p. 7). This was in his childhood. At school we have his own description of the spirit of faith in which he took refuge in God under the persecutions of his schoolfellows.

"Alone, without protection, abandoned by every one, I poured out religious tears before God, offering Him my childish troubles as a sacrifice, and striving to raise myself, by tender sentiments of piety, to the Cross of His Divine Son" (p. 9).

At twelve years old he made his first Communion; of which he says, "It was my last religious joy, the last ray which my mother's soul was to shed on mine. Ere long the shadows thickened around me, a dismal night surrounded me on every side, and no longer did I receive from God in my conscience any sign of life" (p. 11). What transformed this boy of earnest and intelligent piety into an unbeliever?

It would be difficult to find a more instructive fall. "He did not renounce his faith," says F. Chocarne,— "it died within him." He himself has left a clear account of the matter. "I left college at the age of seventeen, with my faith destroyed and my morals injured. . . . This result is easily explained; nothing had supported our faith in a system of education in which the Word of God held but a secondary place, and was enforced neither with argument nor eloquence, whilst at the same time we were daily engaged in studying the masterpieces and heroic examples of antiquity. . . . The modern world created by the Gospel remained entirely unknown to us. Its great men, its saints, its moral and civil superiority, the progress made by humanity under the influence of the Cross, totally escaped our notice" (p. 17).

It is not a new lesson. It is the old story of godless education,—education in which religion "holds but a secondary place"; in which there is "nothing



to support faith." We have drawn attention to it, because education is one of the great battlefields of the Church in our day. Would that we could believe there were no Catholics in England and Ireland for whom the lesson is needed!

One of the most striking portions of F. Chocarne's book is that in which he describes F. Lacordaire's love of the Cross, in the fourteenth chapter. It presents him in a light very different to that of the brilliant orator, with the halo of popularity around him, and receiving ovations as he passed from town to town. It is a light new probably to most of F. Chocarne's readers, and more glorious to him than all his triumphs. The severe austerity of his life, his wonderful acts of self-humiliation, and the craving for the rigours of penance, which drove him to oblige his religious children to scourge his bare shoulders with constant disciplines, to spurn him, to spit upon him,—show him to have been a true scholar in the school of the Saints. As to his penances, there was something quite of the heroic stamp about them, in the nurcilessness towards his own shrinking flesh, and the ardours of divine love which inflamed him.

"His thirst for penances of this description," says F. Chocarne, "appears the more extraordinary from the fact that his exceedingly delicate and sensitive temperament rendered them insupportably painful to him. He shuddered under the slightest blow; but his soul was always firm, and he would entreat them not to mind it; and they were forced to obey. Often when they saw him thus crushed to the ground, trembling with pain and overwhelmed with confusion, they would fall on their knees beside him, and with their eyes filled with tears ask his pardon for having made him suffer so much, and beg him to require it of them no more. 'Ah!' he would reply, 'this is nothing; when you see me suffer too much, you stop, you pity me; but when Jesus Christ writhed under the blows of His executioners, they only struck the harder'" (p. 333).

What, however, seem to us to have the most special interest in these glimpses of F. Lacordaire are the circumstances connected with the condemnation of the "*Avenir*" and the issue of the "*Mirari vos*." Nothing could do greater honour to F. Lacordaire than his exterior and interior attitude towards the Holy See at this time. While De la Mennais was chafing at the reserve and reticence of Rome during the time the question was under examination, and before the Encyclical had been determined on, all that was humbling about his reception in the Holy City did but bring light and health to the soul of Lacordaire. We shall select one or two short extracts from his own words, quoted by F. Chocarne to illustrate his noble submission of his whole soul, intellect, and will to the teaching of the Pope, which he recognizes in so many words as that of the *Church*.

"I did not deliver myself," he wrote "when I arrived at Rome, at the tomb of the Holy Apostles S. Peter and S. Paul, I knelt down and said to God, 'Lord, I begin to feel my weakness, my sight fails me; truth and terror alike escape my grasp; have pity on Thy servant, who comes to Thee with a sincere heart; hear the prayer of the poor.' I know neither the day nor the hour when it took place; but at last I saw what I had not before seen, and I left Rome free and victorious. I had learned from my own experience

that the Church is the deliverer of the human intellect; and as from freedom of intellect all other freedoms flow, I perceived the questions which then agitated the world in their true light" (p. 103).

"After ten years spent in constant efforts to understand the true position of Philosophy with regard to the Church, after agitation of mind . . . whither had I arrived? At the convictions possessed by all those who lean on the mind of the Church, rather than on their own. Oh! how just and holy is the Providence of God, who thus sweetly cradles her docile children in the truth! Others make the circle of the entire world, they seek for something beyond their own country, but the native land of the intellect is that which gives us light, the only place in the whole world where the thoughts of man are at rest. With what wondering admiration did I not then feel the superiority of the Church, that ineffable instinct by which she is guided, that divine discernment which protects her from the smallest shadow of illusion. . . . Oh Rome! it was thus that I beheld thee! Seated amidst the storms of Europe, I saw no anxiety on thy brow and no distrust of thyself: thy glance turned to the four quarters of the world, followed with sublime discernment the development of human affairs in their connection with those that are divine. . . . A suppliant pilgrim, I brought back from thee not gold or perfumes, or precious stones, but something rarer and more unknown—the treasure of truth" (pp. 104-5).

To M. de Montalembert he wrote:—

"My only sagacity has lain in my frank submission. If everything has turned out as I foresaw it would, I only foresaw it by dint of forgetting my own sense. I cannot rejoice at the abyss which obstinacy has dug under the feet of a man who has rendered great services to the Church. I hope that in His own time God may yet stop him in his course: but I do rejoice that the Sovereign Pontiff, the father not merely of one Christian soul, but of all, has at last, by his sacred authority, decided the questions which were tearing to pieces the Church of France" (p. 114).

We cannot forbear giving one more extract:—

"The Church does not say to you, 'See'; that power does not belong to her; but she says 'Believe.' She says to you at the age of twenty-three, attached as you are to certain ideas, what she said to you on the day of your first communion, 'Receive the hidden and incomprehensible God, bow down your reason before that of God, and before the Church, which is His mouth-piece.' Why has the Church been given to us, unless it be to bring us back to the truth, when we have fallen into error. . . . You are astonished at what the Holy See requires of M. de la Mennais: it is certainly harder to submit when we have spoken out before men, than when all has passed between our own hearts and God. This is the special trial reserved for genius" (p. 117).

In the midst of our admiration for this true spirit of Christian faith and docility, we ought not to forbear saying how much we are struck by the phenomenon of the hold which the principles he here so explicitly renounces seem to the end to have kept over his mind. They seem to speak in several passages quoted from him by F. Chocarne in the latter part of the 17th chapter, and still more plainly and painfully in his pamphlet published in 1860, '*De la Liberté, de l'Italie, et de l'Eglise.*' Perhaps the strongest instance of it is given by Father Aylward in the preface to the present volume. There was

no subject on which the 'Mirari vos' spoke more explicitly or more vehemently than on the Freedom of the Press. Well,

"We had to touch," says F. Aylward, "on the freedom of the press . . . I was driven by stress of argument to urge that the fact of the press being perhaps (but not surely) open to you for defence as to others for aggression, signified little; that you were still kept under a powerful tyranny, hostile or favourable to you according to caprice or accident, or the expediency of those who undertake to create and to tutor public opinion; that there was an essential immorality in subjecting men to the action of a vast and mysterious kind of being, arbitrary and irresponsible, a corporate intelligence, invisible, ever present, powerful of intellect, but refusing to own a conscience . . . I was wishing that F. Lacordaire would be on my side; but although I know I used my best French, I could get no hearty response from him; nought but a grave, tender, and patient look, which seemed to me to show that he endured the expression of my views" (pp. x.—xi.).

Something similar occurs at p. viii.

The only solution we can imagine to the problem is to suppose that the effect of early impressions and strongly-formed habits of mind was to render him not fully alive to the bearing and import of those Pontifical instructions to which he meant to submit himself most fully; that his will was docile, but his intellect clouded on this subject by habit and prejudice.

---

*Life and Letters of Madame Swetchine.* By COUNT DE FALLOUX, of the French Academy. Translated by H. W. PRESTON. London: Burns and Oates.

THIS work has reached us too late to be adequately treated in the present number; but we hope that in April we shall be able to do some justice to the admirable lady whose biography it contains.

We opened the volume, almost by accident, at p. 257; and read with amazement the following remark:—

Lamennais's "obstinacy rendered it impossible for Gregory XVI. to hesitate longer. He found it necessary to search out, recapitulate, and call attention to whatever had seemed excessive in 'L'Avenir,' in the Encyclical Letter of Aug. 15, 1832. He did so with regret; and in such moderate terms that a few years later many bishops adopted the general principles of 'L'Avenir,' modified by experience and a clearer insight into the question involved."

Now Gregory XVI. condemned Lamennais's notion, that liberty of worship and of the press are, not the lesser of alternative evils, but positive goods; that they constitute a real social advance. And these principles indeed, we imagine, are what M. de Falloux understands, when he mentions "the general principles of 'L'Avenir.'" In what terms did the Pontiff condemn them? Firstly, it was Lamennais's opinion "that liberty of conscience is to be asserted and vindicated for every

man." But the Holy Father pronounced this to be "a most pestilent error;" nay, "an insanity," rather than merely an "absured and erroneous opinion." Lamennais praised the existing liberty of the press, and desired its increase; but the Pontiff declared that the existing liberty "is most foul and never sufficiently to be execrated and detested." If this is a mild censure, we are really curious to learn M. de Falloux's notion of a severe one. So singular a statement makes us feel less surprised at the scandal which the author gave to many good Catholics last summer at Malines, by his language about liberty of the press.

We have unfeigned personal respect for the great zeal and piety of M. de Falloux and his friends, and we heartily acknowledge the signal services they have rendered to the Church: but the language we have quoted is really serious, and implies the progress of serious doctrinal mischief. Such disrespect to the Church's decrees may issue, when Catholics least expect it, in some deplorable result.

---

*Shooting Niagara: and after?* By THOMAS CARLYLE. London: Chapman and Hall.

THIS is a pamphlet of small dimensions: but it is a genuine Carlylean utterance—quaint, oracular, often dreamy enough, but now and then with "burning fire of genius, like comet-fire, glaring fuliginous through murkiest confusions." Sentiments for the most part of the old stamp: old flame-picture and word-painting too, which, like all things of the spasmodic kind, are apt to tire when prolonged too far. To those who blame the Pope for condemning certain doctrines contained in the famous "Syllabus," we would recommend a calm perusal of the following lively passage:—

"Our accepted axioms about 'Liberty,' 'Constitutional Government,' 'Reform,' and the like objects, are of truly wonderful texture: venerable by antiquity, many of them, and written in all manner of canonical books; or else, the newer part of them, celestially clear as perfect unanimity of all tongues, and *Vox populi Vox Dei*, can make them: axioms confessed, or even inspirations and gospel verities, to the general mind of man. To the mind of here and there a man, it begins to be suspected that perhaps they are only conditionally true; that taken unconditionally, or under changed conditions, they are not true, but false, and even disastrously and fatally so. Ask yourself about 'Liberty,' for example; what you do really mean by it, what in any just and rational soul is that Divine quality of liberty? That a good man be 'free,' as we call it, be permitted to unfold himself in works of goodness and nobleness, is surely a blessing to him, immense and indispensable;—to him and to those about him. But that a bad man be 'free,'—permitted to unfold himself in *his* particular way, is contrariwise the fatallest curse you could inflict on him; curse and nothing else to him and all his neighbours. Him the very heavens call upon you to persuade, to urge, induce, compel, into something of well-doing; if you absolutely cannot, if he will continue in ill-doing,—then for him (I can assure you, though you will be shocked to hear it), the one blessing left is the speediest gallows you can lead him to. Speediest, that at least his ill-doing may cease *quàm primum*."

*The Divinity of Jesus Christ.* A new demonstration, taken from the latest attacks of incredulity. By AUGUSTE NICOLAS, author of *Philosophical Studies of Christianity*. Translated from the French by the Vicomtesse de L. S. J. London: Richardson and Son, 1865.

WE take blame to ourselves for not having earlier noticed this fascinating little volume. It is the production of one of the most eminent living Catholic writers in France, and was written for the purpose of establishing the divine mission and deity of Christ, chiefly against the assaults contained in the well-known blasphemous "*Life of Jesus*," by Renan. On the appearance of the present translation, about two years ago, we took it up, expecting to find in it a mass of solid reasoning, but possessing no other striking attraction beyond what this and the sacred importance of the subject would impart to it. We had not, however, read a dozen pages, when we found ourselves so completely absorbed and drawn on and on, that we could not stop until, in the course of a very short time, we had fairly got to the last line of the last page. We have again, with a view to the present notice, gone through it carefully from beginning to end, with an avidity and interest little, if at all, short of those which accompanied the first perusal.

It is indeed a golden book. The reasoning, at once powerful and exact throughout, is every now and then flavoured with some happy illustration, or seasoned with some scalding irony, which enforces as much as they embellish the argument, captivating the judgment equally with the imagination. It is like the archangel's sword, with its celestial temper and effulgence, cleaving the adamantine skull of the accursed one. Then there are those dramatic effects occasionally produced, which only true genius can impart to such subjects, flushing the pure, but pale, cold cheek of logic with the varied glow of different emotions coming one after the other. At one time, a feeling of jubilant exultation lifted us above ourselves, as we accompanied our author in his assaults on the very strongest strongholds of the enemy, so boasted as impregnable, and saw them crumbling into dust at his every blow. At another, we felt ourselves on fire with indignation—a just and holy indignation—as he rent the veil, and laid open to the light of day the sheer mendacity; the mean, rancorous, hypocritical shuffling; the blind unreason, clothed in the outward garb of a profession of candid and generous philosophy. Sometimes an indescribable emotion, like that of mingled love and pity, touched and melted our hearts, in contemplating the simple delineation, the mere setting forth in its own unclouded and irresistible light of evidence, one of those eternal truths so dear to every true Christian soul, yet so outraged and so blasphemed.

And justly so. "What!" exclaims M. Nicolas, "shall it be said that Jesus, in the faith and love of whom eighteen centuries have sunk to rest, and who still presides over the destinies of the world;—who was the inspirer of civilization with all its glories, and who is still that of all lofty, devoted, and heroic virtue,—that Christ, consoler of all sorrow, Saviour of all misery, Redeemer from all servitude, towards whom the whole human race stretches

forth its grateful and suppliant arms ;—that God, at the foot of whose altars all life, both public and social, throng to offer Him their prayers and their thanksgivings ;—who is the judge of our justice, and the judicial security of our oaths ; before whom the pride of our armies bows down, and the exemplary majesty of the sovereign prostrates itself,—is to be insulted and smitten—is to be termed a *simple villager*, the *most charming of all rabbies*, whose *parables are crowded with impossibilities*—a *utopist*, a *dreamer*, a *man of anarchy*, &c., and, finally, a *madman* and an *impostor* :—this shall be done and said, and our Christian blood may not flow swifter through our veins ; and a so-called *mutual respect* must forbid our qualifying such conduct with the sole epithet which is its due. And the words impiety and blasphemy which, did they not exist, ought to be created on purpose, must be purposely expunged from our language ! and M. Renan shall be inviolable, rather than the SON OF GOD !” \*

As we have already (April, 1864) devoted an article of some length to Renan's book, we do not purpose returning to the subject ; and the less so, because we rather believe the work has already begun to experience the fate to which all such lying and shallow productions are ultimately doomed. Our object at present is simply to draw our readers' attention to M. Nicolas's volume, not as a mere refutation—complete and triumphant as it is—of Renan, but as containing so much of absolute and permanent interest in reference to certain aspects of the Christian evidences. We will note briefly a few of these.

The first four chapters are introductory, and are entitled—The Situation ; The Question ; Our Method ; Their Method. In the first of these the following just and very remarkable statement is found :—

“Until these latter times, incredulity had only engaged in polemics of a negative sort. It had been limited to the task of battling with, or of eluding the historical proofs and explanations of Christianity. But it had hitherto prudently abstained from giving any explanation of that great fact from its own point of view. Therein was contained, if we well consider the case, an implicit avowal of the truth it was seeking to oppose. For after all, between belief and unbelief in Christianity, stood Christianity itself : I mean by that, that important and unique event, the expectation of which occupied the old world, as its realization does the modern, and which, personified in the grand figure of Jesus Christ, subordinates all history to His wonderful existence, as to a law in which and by which it is concentrated and governed. Now, an explanation is requisite to this essentially historical fact, to this phenomenon, the most formidable of all history. We have constantly given *our* explanation. Wherefore did incredulity never give its own until now ?” †

In the chapter on miracles we have an old argument of S. Thomas‡ put in a new and improved form, and well illustrated and urged :—

“We do not think we are overstepping lawful grounds, in establishing, from the fact of certain averred prodigies, a simple precedent of admissibility

\* Pp. 15, 16. The italics and punctuation of the extracts are always preserved, unless where there is some manifest error of the press.

† Pp. 11, 12.

‡ Contra Gentes, b. i. c. 6.



for other prodigies which are yet liable to debate. This is, in fact, arguing from the known to the unknown, and proceeding by analogies.

"If an extraordinary being, so extraordinary as is Jesus Christ, according to common consent, performed two orders of prodigies, one of which we see, whilst we do not see the other: the order of prodigies visible to us, ought surely to recommend to our attention the other which is invisible, but which reposes upon evidence. What then must not be the case, when these two orders of prodigies are not only analogous, but when the one presages the other, or when they stand in the reciprocal position of means and effects?"

"Now this is just the case with Jesus and His Gospel. It is said in the Gospel, that He had command over the elements, that He restored the sight of the blind, that He caused the deaf to hear, the paralytic to walk, and that He raised the dead. We have seen nothing of that. But in the same Gospel it is related that He said to some fishermen, the scum of Judea, to one Simon, James, and John: 'I will make you henceforth to be *fishers of men*': and we see that what He said He did. Again we read that He said: '*When I shall be lifted up from the earth, then shall all men come unto Me*': and here too we see that He did what He said. We read of His saying: '*Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it*': and again we see His words confirmed by the event. Further on He declared: '*All power has been given to Me in heaven and on earth, go ye therefore and teach all nations, &c., and lo I am with you always even unto the end of the world*': and here too, what He predicted has been literally accomplished. I select these prodigies amongst many others; they are twofold; prodigies both as regards the prediction and the facts accomplished. We need no commission to verify them. The world was pagan, and had become Christian. How was this done? By a cross. The world remained Christian, notwithstanding all the struggles of hell; and it is still preserved to Christianity. By whom? By the successor of the first Peter. This is a prodigy, and one that we see. Christianity is a miracle, *the greatest of miracles*, as it is called by M. Proudhon.

"Now I declare that this *greatest of miracles* which is visible to us, ought to predispose us to belief in those lesser miracles of the Gospels which we have not seen; and that the sight of the human race, that mighty Lazarus, resuscitated and still walking before our eyes, ought to serve as a pledge and voucher for that other Lazarus of Bethania, whom we can only see by the Gospel's evidence.

"I might even add, that the latter fact is visible in the former one, and that a world converted without any miracles, would be of itself the most astonishing of prodigies." \*

The following striking passage occurs at the close of the chapter on the Death of Christ:—

"How is it that that death, in every way similar to all other deaths, according to M. Renan, has changed the whole face of the world, and exercised a more powerful influence than any life? It is usually life which founds, and death which destroys. The contrary is to be observed in Jesus Christ alone. His life was unfruitful, and it was only in His death, and by His death, that He renewed the world. It is from the Cross that He attracts all to Him: and it is upon that gibbet of infamy, and in the same state, that He has continued for two thousand years, and still continues, to sanctify and vivify the world . . . . .



"If you strip that death of its divine character . . ., then, the more disproportionate to the event it becomes, the greater the impossibility of reconciling them. You fall into an absurdity—a causeless effect. Nay, what is worse, an uncalculable effect, the cause of which is—nothing; that is to say, a monstrosity destructive of reason: consequently, one of the strongest proofs *a contrario* of the truth of our faith.

"M. Renan, as if still further to conduce to this result, observes that 'else Messiahs were at that time very numerous in Judea, but that their various attempts had all invariably the same result; 'the year following, their death was forgotten.'"<sup>\*</sup>

In the chapter on the Resurrection, our author draws out, with perfect clearness and irresistible force, the numerous and striking evidences of the blind and obstinate incredulity of the Apostles on that fact, as a circumstance adding peculiar and extraordinary weight to their subsequent attestation of the fact, and to the argument drawn from their labouring and suffering and dying to confirm that attestation. The whole reasoning of this chapter is magnificent both in its splendour and its strength: it is at once fascinating and overpowering, and sweeps the reader before it, "like a wave of the Atlantic, three thousand miles long." We would like to give extracts from it, as also from the brief but delightful chapter,—*"The Virgin Mary, Mother of God and Mother of Men."* But we have already, we think, given enough to excite the reader's thirst for the book itself.

We alluded above to M. Nicolas's powers of irony. The following is a specimen. Renan's account of the end of Judas† is that,—*"perhaps, retired in the field of Hakeldama, he led a tranquil, obscure life, whilst his old friends were conquering the world, and spreading the report of his infamy."*

On which remarks M. Nicolas:—

"If, following in the step of M. Renan, I were to imitate him and take the license of conjecturing, I might say, *Perhaps* Judas is still alive, and wandering on the face of the earth. *Perhaps*, ever possessed of the same spirit of apostasy and hatred by which he was animated, he still seeks to betray the Son of Man with a kiss. *Perhaps* M. Renan is but an assumed name, and that the Iscariot is the real author of the *Life of Jesus*. Mere fancies, you will exclaim. So I confess they are; but still fancies for fancies, these are at all events not so utterly contrary to all moral likelihood, as those of M. Renan."

With what grace and spirit this translation is executed, the preceding extracts sufficiently indicate.

---

<sup>\*</sup> Pp. 333-5.

† On the tendency of certain Protestant writers to whitewash Judas Iscariot, see our number for January 1864, p. 87, and for April 1864, p. 407, note.

*On Justification. What saith the Scripture?* By Canon S. ECCLES.  
London. 1861.

THIS little volume was published before our New Series began; but accidentally it was not noticed in the DUBLIN REVIEW. This omission has been pointed out to us, and we hasten to repair it. The great value of the work is that it gives a clear and sound exposition of the Catholic doctrine on the very important subjects of justification and merit, together with a no less clear and accurate account of the more prevalent Protestant heresies on the same subjects. It also contains a copious array of Scripture texts and arguments in support of the Catholic dogmas; to which is subjoined a series of replies to the leading Protestant objections, always, we think, successful; sometimes singularly forcible and original. To those who have not studied, or have not the means of studying, the matter in scientific treatises of theology, we would recommend this work as well suited to them. The author's style is occasionally somewhat rugged and abrupt, and he now and then reintroduces topics which he had already disposed of. He is rough-and-ready, and evidently sets no store by graces and felicities: readers of kindred minds will therefore no doubt peruse him with congenial relish.

The whole subject of grace, whether viewed dogmatically or polemically, is one of the very highest importance. The great heresy of Luther on justification had been fully worked out in his mind for a couple of years before the dispute about indulgences commenced,\* and while he yet fondly imagined, it would seem, that his views were not at variance with the tradition and teaching of the Church. These views, with which in all essentials those of Calvin coincide, not only pluck up by the roots the whole Catholic doctrine on justification and merit, but underlie the whole, or nearly the whole, fabric of the genuine Protestant idea of the Church. They are held at this day by the Evangelicals within the Established Church, by the Presbyterians, and by the Methodists. There is not, and we can hardly conceive possible, a more fatal example of that terrible spiritual delusion, to which we alluded in our last number (page 263). The sinner is justified, not by sincere sorrow for the past and firm resolution of amendment for the future, based on a firm belief in the infinite mercy and power of God, but simply by a firm persuasion on his own part that he is justified. He bides his time, and at some particular moment receives, in some spasmodic or sensational form, an inward conviction and assurance that he has obtained "free pardon," and thus becomes "a pleasant child of the Lord." This is called, in the slang of the sects, "conviction of sin": it is justification by faith alone, or more properly by assurance, or still more properly by the most astounding impudence.

Then in this process of justification, the sins are by no means washed out—not one of them. There they remain in the soul in all their deformity; but the assured and confident sinner is clothed with the *imputed* sanctity of

\* Döllinger, *Life of Luther*.

Christ, as with an enveloping mantle. That sanctity works no intrinsic change in his soul in reference to past sin, but God looks upon him the same as if it did. Calvin's golden ball in the old pot means exactly the same thing. The justified sinner is still the old pot he was before; but he has "laid hold of" the golden ball of Christ's justice, and this is to him assurance infallible. This, they say, is the true Christian humility which ascribes all to the Saviour and nothing at all to ourselves. It is astonishing how absolutely and completely this delusion takes possession of those who have once wedded themselves to it. Even in that dread hour, the very thought of which made the saints to fear and tremble, it seems to exercise its most potent and fascinating spell. The rector of Watton, a very decided Evangelical, on his death-bed cries out, "Heaven is near" . . . "Say I am very happy in God's love" . . . When severe remedies were applied, he said, 'These are fiery serpents. I wonder the Papists have never used them as instruments of torture, to extort confessions.' . . . Then to his daughter, who was nursing him, 'You have a very angelic office, my child, ministering to an heir of salvation.'\* Another, a Methodist, who had been for many years president of the Conference, cried out in his last hour, "Glory! Glory!" His biographers tell us that, when on his death-bed, "his soul was kept in perfect peace [sic]; the slightest shadow of doubt or anxiety as to his eternal blessedness never crossed his mind."† To these we could add other examples without end.

Such are some of the baleful and wide-spread heresies, against which Canon Eccles's book is directed. Those among our readers who are placed in circumstances in which they require an effective weapon to meet them, cannot do better than procure his needle-gun.

---

*Epistolæ Romanorum Pontificum Genuinæ et quæ ad eos scriptæ sunt, a S. Petri Hilario usque ad Pelagium II.; ex schedis CLAR. COUSTANTII aliisque editis, adhibitis præstantissimis codicibus Italiæ et Germaniæ, recensuit et edidit ANDREAS THIEL, S. Theol. Doct., &c. &c. Fasciculus I. Brunsbergæ in ædibus Eduardi Peter. 1867.*

EVERY one interested in the ecclesiastical sciences will welcome this work as a most important boon. Various currents of controversy at the present day combine to throw the student more than ever on the original documents of the early ages of the Church, and an accessible and trustworthy text of the Epistles of the Popes of the first centuries has become proportionately necessary. Many a regret must have escaped the possessors of Coustant's single volume, that his work was cut short in the middle of the 5th century. Various attempts have been made to continue his labours by his brethren of the Congregation of S. Maur and others, but death and different

---

\* Memoir of the Rev. Edward Bickersteth (1852), vol. ii. pp. 453-5.

† Memoir of the Rev. Adam Averell (1848), pp. 426-7.

obstacles have interfered with their completion. At length Coustant has found a successful continuator in Dr. Thiel, who has just given to the world the first-fruits of six years' toil in the great libraries of Europe.

Dr. Thiel has wisely begun his work where the want is most felt,—at the point where Coustant leaves off. The present fasciculus of 512 pages is only a portion of the first volume. It commences with the Pontificate of S. Hilary, in 449, and goes down to the death of S. Gelasius in 496. The whole period from S. Hilary to S. Gregory the Great (the limit which the author proposes to himself) will be comprised in two volumes, the third and fourth of his collection. After their completion he will go back to the first and second volumes, which will contain the period embraced by Coustant. Even here, however, Dr. Thiel's work will be far from a mere republication. Coustant used for his volume only such manuscripts as he found in the French collections. Hardouin, Mansi, Labbe, and the two Ballerini, have collated a larger number for such epistles as they have edited. But Dr. Thiel was determined nothing should be wanting to the perfection of his work on this score; he has searched with persevering pains, of which his Introduction will give the reader such an idea as can be gathered from a mere enumeration of manuscripts, the collections of the Vatican, Vallicella, Barberini, and Sessoriani libraries at Rome, and those of the other great libraries of Italy and Germany. In the Vatican he was fortunate enough to find some valuable materials which had been prepared by Coustant for his intended second volume, and which, though incomplete, were of great service to him.

The edition will be found most complete. The various readings of the text are given at the foot of the page, with a reference in each case to the source where they are found. The critical dissertations and notices on each epistle are placed consecutively at the beginning of the volume instead of interrupting the series of epistles, as in other collections. Thus, though the epistles as yet published reach only to the end of the Pontificate of S. Gelasius, the present fasciculus comprises the dissertations for the pontificates of S. Hilary, S. Simplicius, S. Felix II., S. Gelasius, S. Anastasius II., S. Symmachus, and S. Hormisdas. The work includes not only the Epistles of the Popes but also Epistles addressed to them, critical notices on missing and spurious Epistles, and a short life of each Pope, before the series of letters belonging to his reign.

Dr. Thiel has abandoned the venerable form of the folio, hitherto usually adopted in works of this class. In spite of the traditional reverence and some real advantages attaching to it, we believe most readers will be glad of his choice of the more convenient, if less dignified form of the octavo. We trust the work will find a good sale in England.

---

*Short Sermons, chiefly on Doctrinal Subjects, preached in the Chapel of S. Mary's College, Oscott.* By Rev. C. MEYNELL, D.D. London: Richardson.

FROM some accident for which we cannot account, this volume, published in 1866, only came into our hands last October. We should otherwise have certainly noticed it on its first appearance, as it possesses great merit.

There are two very different classes of sermons. Those of one class aim at producing an immediate and powerful impression on the *will*; while those of the other class furnish the *intellect* with truths and principles, which may be a matter for subsequent reflection, and which, as time goes on, may issue in great fruit of devotion and piety. The latter have, of course, a particular value, where those addressed possess a cultivated mind; and are especially adapted for such a congregation as Dr. Meynell's, the students of a Catholic college. Dr. Meynell's seem to us amongst the best specimens of this class. The various thoughts are either originated by himself, or, at least, thoroughly made his own; and the doctrines which they illustrate are highly important. The sermons are written with great simplicity, and an entire absence of conventionality, unreality, and exaggeration.

Those which struck us the most are perhaps the 4th, on "The Theory of Happiness," and the 24th, on "Our Blessed Lady." We observe in the latter with much interest (p. 215), that the author accounts God's decree of Mary's creation to be dependent (according to our mode of conception), on His gracious purpose of the Incarnation: a view which appears to us serviceable on more than one theological point. Again, as to her endowments (p. 216), she is "a mirror in which the beauty and perfection of God are reflected so far as it is possible for the creature to resemble the Creator."

Passing to another matter, Dr. Meynell (p. 7) implies the infallibility of the Encyclical and Syllabus; and says distinctly that the various matters on which the former gives instruction "pertain to religion," and are therefore within the sphere of infallibility. We do not, indeed, quite see how to reconcile this with some of his expressions in pp. 156-7; but that may very probably come from our failing rightly to apprehend his language in the latter passage.

The following remark seems to us very true, and we do not remember to have met with it elsewhere. Those non-Catholics, Dr. Meynell thinks, and those only, are in a hopeful condition, who admit that there *is* somewhere real objective truth, and whose great desire is to find it:—

"The light of Reason teaches that, if there is a God, since there is a God there must be somewhere in the world one unchangeable Truth of God; and that the right use of reason is to guide men to it; and that the highest duty of reason is, having found it, to bow down and submit in homage to Him who gave it. He who clearly sees, really believes, and conscientiously acts upon this principle, however far he may seem from the Church, he is 'of the Truth:' he will hear the words of God. To such a one, brethren, you shall

show your truth, and give 'a reason of that hope which is in you.' But as to all others, if you be wise, you shall leave them to God."

We doubt whether in p. 220, Dr. Meynell takes sufficient pains to distinguish those opinions which he ascribes to "heretics"—*i.e.*, Jansenistic or Calvinistic tenets—from those which are advocated by orthodox theologians, *e.g.* Augustinians and Thomists, with the Church's full permission. At the same time, the general drift of this sermon on "co-operation" seems to us admirable; and indeed the volume as a whole is undoubtedly calculated to do important service.

---

*The Comedy of Convocation in the English Church, in two scenes.* Edited by Archdeacon CHASUBLE, D.D. London: Freeman, 102, Fleet-street.

NEVER, perhaps, has a pamphlet by an unknown author, and upon an ecclesiastical subject, produced so great a sensation as this. And it is by an author, not only unknown, but anonymous. It richly deserves the attention it has gained; for we should be quite at a loss to mention another combining so many remarkable talents in the same measure. In argument it is thoughtful, logical, and weighty; in language clear, concise, and forcible; while, at the same time, it abounds with the richest humour. It professes to give an account of two discussions, in Convocation; or rather of one in the Convocation Home itself, and of another between the leading members of Convocation, meeting in a less formal manner in the drawing-room of one of their number, whose home adjoins to the "fine old historical Abbey." We can easily understand that any leading orator in Convocation (say the Bishop of Oxford, or Archdeacon Denison) might condemn it as a mere satire, unjust and untrue to nature: because the supposed speeches are utterly unlike what those gentlemen and their friends are really in the habit of delivering. But this would be only because, from a natural prejudice, he would miss the exact object of the pamphlet. The author evidently did not intend to give us speeches which any of the leading Anglican divines either have delivered, or would be likely to deliver in Convocation, or, indeed, any place else. And why should he? Are they not written in the supplements to the *Guardian* the Wednesday after the yearly meeting of Convocation? What he has given us are the speeches which the divines of each school and party would make if they were perfectly logical and fearless in working out the real legitimate results of their own principles. It is no impeachment upon such a portrait that the gentlemen whom it represents do not recognize, and would not be disposed to acknowledge, its truth. That would imply in them a very uncommon measure of the rare gift "to see ourselves as others see us." But after a very careful reading, we are bound to say that we do not see that the portraiture of the different Anglican schools is really in any one instance unfair and untrue. The *Dramatis Personæ*, as set forth on the first page, are "Deans Blunt, Pliable, Primitive, Pompous, and Critical; the Venerable Archdeacons Jolly, Theory, Chasuble; the Rev. Doctors Easy, Viewy, and Candour; and the Reverends Athanasius Benedict, Lavender Kidds, the

Prolocutor of the House ; the Professor of History and the Professor of Theology. Most of these names describe the character they shadow. Mr. Kidds is a popular preacher of the low Church, or so-called Evangelical School. The Professors do not represent any particular persons, but rather mean History and Theology, although the latter Professor also sets forth the feelings which must, almost of necessity, be called forth in the mind of an honest man, set to teach Protestant theology to Protestant students.

The first scene opens in the Jerusalem chamber, where Dr. Easy proposes the question of which he had given notice, "Would it be considered heresy in the Church of England to deny the existence of God?" or, as he puts it in a more convenient form, "Would a clergyman, openly teaching that there was no God, be liable to suspension?" Upon this the different speakers say, as we have already remarked, not, indeed, exactly what they would say if the subject were really proposed for discussion, but what their respective principles would legitimately suggest. Archdeacon Jolly said:—

"What the Church of England especially prided herself upon was the breadth of her views. No view could be broader than that just stated; and therefore none more likely to meet with the sanction of the Privy Council, which, he apprehended, was the real point to be kept in view in this interesting discussion."

Dean Blunt suggests what the sentence of the Supreme Court would be, viz. :—

"We find that the Church of England is not opposed to the existence of a God. At the same time, we cannot overlook the fact that the Nineteenth Article, in affirming that all Churches, even the Apostolic, have erred in matters of faith, obviously implies that the Church of England may also err in the same way. Therefore, the Church of England may err in teaching that there is a God. We conclude, therefore, that, whilst on the one hand the Archbishop [who is supposed to have been the preacher who had been called in question for heretical teaching] has taken an extreme or one-sided view of the teaching of the Church; on the other, for the reason assigned, it is undoubtedly open to every clergyman either to believe in or to deny the existence of God."

Archdeacon Theory, arguing that the Church's fallibility is the cardinal doctrine of the Anglican Church, says :—

"This was his answer to the question before the House, 'Would it be heresy in an Anglican to deny the existence of God?' He replied that it might be heresy to *deny* the fact, but that it was the plainest duty to *doubt* it.

"And here he would venture to hazard one other observation upon what he had ventured to call the 'Cardinal Doctrine' of the Church's fallibility. It was not uncommon in these days for Anglicans to become Roman Catholics. Did he blame them? As a Protestant he must answer, 'Yes'; as an Anglican, 'No.' He was willing to believe that they were guided in that act mainly by their unconscious respect for the teaching of the English Church. For it was obvious that all who were docile to the teaching of that Church must be supremely devoted to her dogma of fallibility, since that dogma is evidently the most fruitful in its consequences, as well as the most clearly defined, in the whole range of her theology. But it was equally clear that as long as an Anglican remained in the Church of England, he could



give no adequate proof of his belief in this essential dogma of her fallibility. He might believe it, or he might not. But once let him *leave* the Church, and by that act he manifested to the world his firm conviction that the Church of England was fallible. Consequently the highest tribute an Anglican could pay to his own Church was to go out of her, and the best proof he could give of belief in her teaching was to connect himself without loss of time with some other communion."

We were specially struck with the account given by Dean Pliable of his sermon as a curate, which he assures us has been "warmly approved by many of the most eminent clergy on both sides of the Atlantic." His text was:—

"One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism. These words, my brethren, on a first impression may seem to imply an undue restriction on the liberty of the Protestant mind. Listen, however, while I explain to you the Anglican theology, as taught by your Bishop, your Rector, and myself, and you will confess that whatever S. Paul may have designed by Christian unity, the Church of England has put an interpretation on his words which relieves them from all suspicion of intolerance.

"(1.) In regard of Baptism, what the great apostle calls one of the foundations of Christianity, you may believe, with your Rector, who you are aware was appointed over you by your Bishop, that *without* Baptism it is impossible to enter into the kingdom of Heaven, and that it is always accompanied by the new birth.

"(2.) At the same time you are evidently at liberty to consider it, with your Bishop (to whom both your Rector and myself have promised a faithful obedience), to be a mere form or ceremony, having no connexion whatever with the new birth and therefore wholly unnecessary to salvation.

"(3.) Finally, you may agree with me, your approved and licensed Curate, as regards Christian doctrine in general and Baptism in particular, that extremes are always to be avoided, and that, on the whole, it is better to accept Baptism as a customary and not disedifying ceremony, extremely well adapted to little children, but without entertaining any morbid prejudice as to its possible effects on the soul."

He applied the same principle in a manner equally forcible, to the "Lord's Supper," to the "Visible Church," to the "Roman Church," to "Confession and Absolution," and was going on to other subjects, when the clerk came up the pulpit-stairs, with a slip of paper from the Rector, on which were written the two words "Pray desist!" and the same Rector, next morning, counselled him "in the kindest manner to seek another curacy!"

We have no space to follow the speeches of Dr. Viewy, who considered obedience the first duty of a clergyman, and who therefore when he was a curate held it to be his duty to teach the views of the Bishop on Sunday and those of the Rector on week-days. He thought that there could be no heresy without disobedience, and that therefore it would not be heresy for a curate to deny the existence of God if he did it in obedience either to the Rector or the Bishop.

But we must not omit the sentence of the Professor of Theology, who was convinced,

"and he thought the moment had arrived to make this observation,—if only as a matter of justice to the High Church party,—that, in

point of essential unmitigated Protestantism, the Puseyites surpassed their Low Church rivals, as much as they did in ability and learning."

This he clearly establishes by several instances.

The proposal of Mr. Lavender Kidds, that the House should vote a strong protest against Rome, led to an explanation from Archdeacon Jolly that—

"a deputation was sent last year to Rome to obtain a private interview with the Pope, in order to entreat his Holiness not to reform a single Popish corruption; the motives set forth in the preamble of the address presented to his Holiness were in substance the following: that a large body of respectable clergymen who had no personal ill-will towards the present occupant of the Holy See, had maintained themselves and their families in comfort for many years, exclusively by the abuse of Popery; and if Popery were taken away, they could not but contemplate the probable results with uneasiness and alarm. Moreover, many eminent members of the profession had gained a reputation for evangelical wit, learning and piety, as well as high dignities in the Church of England, by setting forth in their sermons and at public meetings, with all their harrowing details, the astounding abominations of the Church of Rome. The petitioners implored his Holiness not to be indifferent to the position of these gentlemen. Many of their number had privately requested the deputation to plead their cause with the amiable and benevolent Pius IX. Thus, the great and good Dr. M'Nickel represented respectfully that he had filled his Church and let his pews during three-and-twenty years by elegantly slandering priests and nuns, and powerfully illustrating Romish superstitions. A clergyman of noble birth had attained to the honours of the Episcopate by handling alternately the same subjects and a particularly pleasing view of the millennium; and had thus been enabled to confer a valuable living on his daughter's husband who otherwise could not have hoped to attain one. An eminent canon of an old Roman Catholic abbey owed his distinguished position, which he hoped to be allowed to retain, to the fact of his having proved so clearly that the Pope was Antichrist; and earnestly entreated his Holiness to do nothing to forfeit that character. A well-known doctor of Anglican divinity was on the point of quitting the country, in despair of gaining a livelihood, when the idea of preaching against Popery was suggested to him, and he had now reason to rejoice that he had abandoned the foolish scheme of emigration. Even a High Church Bishop had been so hampered by suspicions of Romanistic tendencies, which were perfectly unfounded, that he had only saved himself from general discredit by incessant abuse of Popery, though he was able to say, in self-defence, that he did not believe a word of his own invective. Finally, a young clergyman, who had not hitherto much distinguished himself, having often vainly solicited a member of his congregation to favour his evangelical attachment, at length hit upon a new expedient, and preached so ravishing a discourse upon the matrimonial prohibitions of the Roman Church, and drew so appalling a picture of the domestic infelicities of the Romish priesthood, that on the following Monday morning the young lady made him an offer of her hand and fortune."

This passage, worthy of Swift himself, is followed by others quite as good if we had space to quote them.

The second debate, which was in private in Dr. Easy's drawing-room, was on the question, whether Anglican orders are divine or human. The great mass of the clergy present agreed that they are human. But nothing could surpass the discussion between the Rev. Athanasius Benedict and the Rev.

Lavender Kidds upon the question of celibacy. Mr. Benedict had just returned from Rome :

"He had seen the Pope for a few moments, and received his blessing, but his Holiness declined to admit him to a second interview, which he very much regretted, as he was anxious to convince him of the Catholicity of the English Church. However, he had seen Cardinal Barnabo, at his official residence, who received him courteously, and seemed disposed to listen to his questions ; but unfortunately an Oriental bishop happened to come in on business, and his Eminence requested him to call another day. He had intended to ask him whether there was any Catholic precedent by which an individual might appoint himself superior of a religious order of his own creation, without having made any previous noviciate ? whether, if his bishop was an ignorant heretic, he might treat his foolish opposition with contempt ? whether, in case of necessity, he might teach his Church, supposing his Church to be incapable of teaching him ? whether, if he should be excommunicated by all his monks, and excommunicate them all in return, it was his duty or theirs to pay the debts of the monastery ?"—whether (Dr. Easy here observed, somewhat stiffly, that the subject under consideration at that meeting was the character of English orders, &c.)

Whoever the author of this pamphlet may be, he has, at least, proved that England possesses a very powerful, logical, and humorous writer ; and we hope he may follow up his present most successful effort by others in a similar strain.

---

*The Cause of Poor Catholic Emigrants pleaded before the Catholic Congress of Belgium, September 5, 1867.* Being an address spoken before the second section of the Congress sitting on questions of Christian Charity and social economy, by the Rev. HENRY FORMBY, Priest of the Diocese of Birmingham. Longmans. 1867.

PERHAPS no really great work has ever been accomplished until some one man being stirred to the depths of his spirit, has devoted himself to it with a degree of earnestness and perseverance which seem to other men enthusiastic and extreme. The mass of men have so much to do which presses directly upon themselves, that, with regard to those which belong much to every one else as to themselves, they content themselves with admitting their importance and then leaving them alone. The world, therefore, is under deep obligations to any man who, seeing a work of real importance neglected or only half attended to, and convinced that there is no good reason why he should not be the man to undertake it, determines to devote himself to it, as if there were no other cause for his creation save that he might glorify God by accomplishing for Him that particular work. One of the most thoughtful writers of our day (Mr. Helps) commenting on the fact that Prince Henry of Portugal was urged to devote himself to the discovery of unknown regions, "especially because he saw that neither mariner nor merchant was likely to adopt an enterprise in which there was no clear hope of profit ; and among great men and princes he knew no one but himself who was inclined to it," adds, "This is not an uncommon motive ; a man

sees something which ought to be done, knows of no one who will do it but himself, and so is driven to the enterprise, even should it be repugnant to him." If we are not mistaken in our estimate of Mr. Formby's character, it is much in this spirit that he has taken up the question of our Catholic emigrants. We heartily wish him success ; and, moreover, we are sanguine in our expectation of it. For the work is one of first-class importance, and there exist abundant means of accomplishing it. For ourselves we feel doubly interested in his success, because it was, as he tells us, by a spark struck by some words of ours that the fire was kindled in his own breast which has already broken out into a flame, and which we trust will not be extinguished till it has borne light and hope to countless Catholic emigrants.

Mr. Formby's plan is that—

"Some religious communities should possess themselves of a sufficiently large region of good arable land, and having first erected their own home and church upon it, should proceed to offer to settlers, bringing with them proper testimonials, on easy terms, a cottage and a holding of land, which they could come to occupy and cultivate, finding the Altar and the Catechism already on the ground to receive them ; so as to anticipate the necessity of the means of salvation having to run in search of the emigrants, only to find them so very far gone in heathenism and demoralization that their eventual recovery, if not totally hopeless, can never be otherwise than quite exceptionally of any very great promise. Houses of Trappist Monks, for example, might in this respect become, in a certain sense, the very apostles and guardian angels of at least the agricultural emigrants and of those artisans whom agriculture most needs and calls forth.

"Again, a second mode of most effectually patronizing the cause of indigent emigrants would be by the formation of a fund destined to assist poor and deserving families to pay their passage ; but, as need scarcely to be said, a fund of this kind presupposes the work of the preparation of a suitable home to receive the family on their arrival to have been already accomplished.

"The most perfect work, however, in behalf of the poor emigrants that a Christian imagination can form, would be a large and well-ordered settlement under the protection of a Catholic power and Catholic laws, on the model of the 'reductions' of Paraguay, which were due to the patient sagacious prudence, and indefatigable charity of the Jesuit Fathers. On a plan of this kind the surplus labour of the colony might be devoted, under management equally wise and disinterested as that of the Jesuits of Paraguay, to the formation of a fund to cover the cost of bringing out other deserving and indigent families" (p. 28).

It is impossible that any plan of operations relating to interests so vast should be matured in the mind of any man prior to experience. It is only by many endeavours, and after many failures, that success in any great undertaking is attained. Mr. Formby's plan, therefore, must not stand or fall by its details. Of these, one man may dislike one, and one another. Experience may prove that some which seem easy must be abandoned, and may suggest other things of which neither he nor any one else has thought beforehand ; but this is no impeachment of the importance, nay, the necessity, of the undertaking. It is notorious to friends and foes alike that something is urgently needed for the religious interests of our Catholic emigrants. Protestants, who are cut to the heart by seeing the obstinate adherence of the

Irish, for instance, to the Catholic faith, are now apt to boast that in the New World they (or at least their children) fall away from it; and hence they argue with Macaulay, that the reason why they cleave to the ancient faith at home is, that "the national feeling, which in happier countries has been directed against Rome, has in Ireland been directed against England." Only the day before that on which we write, we have seen this statement triumphantly urged by a writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette*. An Irish Protestant prelate (one of those who have the ague of Protestantism in its hot fit) boasted a few years ago that the Irish in America are drawn from the Church by "Protestant missionaries." The remark was highly characteristic. He was satisfied: although no one pretends that those who have ceased to be Catholics have become Anglicans, or believe in any other religion. As far as they cease to be Catholics they simply become nothing. The only "missionaries" to whom they lend an ear are (the most efficient and successful of all missionaries of Protestantism) the world, the flesh, and the devil. But so it is, even religious Protestants seem to consider that it matters little what people believe, so that they only abandon the Catholic faith. Each man no doubt holds that it would be best if they agreed with him; still he is content so that they only cease to "hear the Church." And that too many of those who by their birth ought to be hereditary Catholics are thus lost, is only too true. The parents settle in the back woods or the wide prairies, their children are brought up without sacraments, without priests, without schooling, and the original generation, as it dies off, is succeeded by another, which has only just a vague tradition that its ancestors were Catholics, but is quite ignorant what the words mean. We fear it can hardly be an exaggeration to say that there must be at this moment in America at least many tens of thousands who have been thus lost to the Church, not only without their own intention, but almost without their own knowledge. And we cannot doubt that by some plan like that sketched out by Mr. Formby, they might, by God's grace, have been as firm Catholics as the descendants of the first Canadians actually are. The question then is, whether the new regions which are now every day filling up, shall be sown with good seed or with weeds; whether the children of our Catholic emigrants shall be Catholics, zealous to spread the faith through the New World, or whether they shall form, at best, a part of that vast heathen population which it is the task of the Church in America gradually to leaven.

We need not say, therefore, how heartily we sympathize with Mr. Formby, and wish him success in his undertaking. That there is no insuperable obstacle to it, is proved (to mention nothing else) by the astonishing material prosperity of the Mormon settlement, to which we lately called attention in our notice of Mr. Hepworth Dixon's very interesting and valuable work, "New America." No one supposes indeed that the Mormon society can very long hold together. It belongs to a class, the characteristic of which is to flourish for a season, "like a green bay tree," and then to wither up from the root; and the special form which the deadly poison takes in them is always a spirit of division. We are not, therefore, surprised already to hear rumours of separation among the Mormonites. They may possibly tide over the present difficulty; they may hold together during the life of Brigham

Young, or even a little longer, but they can no more remain in permanent union, than the men who combined to build the tower of Babel. The poison in their blood must break out ; they will divide and subdivide, until in the end the Mormon name is forgotten by all but learned students of history. But meanwhile there is a permanent lesson to be derived from their temporary success. It is, that when men settle, even in a desolate wilderness, really convinced that their community is moulded by a Divine law, and that its success is intrusted by God Himself to their united labours, they will soon cause that "wilderness to blossom like the rose." Much more, when they not only imagine that they have, but when they truly have, a supernatural principle of union—when they have God really among them—when they are united, not merely as settlers in the same community, but by the ties of Christian charity. One society there is upon earth which can thus found colonies endued with a principle of permanent union. Is it too much to hope that the members of that society may bring its principles to bear upon the really awful tide of emigration, which is, of all the characteristics of our day, the most pregnant with important consequences for future ages ?

We must not imagine that if the thing had been to be done at all, it would have been done before this. The fact is, that the sort of emigration which is the peculiar characteristic of our day is a very new thing in the world, and has taken men so much by surprise that they have not yet collected their minds and bent their energies to direct and control it. In the first three centuries after the discovery of America, colonization, first from Spain and Portugal, and afterwards from England, was carried on by authority. Some great man founded a colony, and settled in it a number of families of one race and one religion. There were impediments enough both to the material and religious welfare of the colonies which do not now exist. But the existing system of emigration, in which each man, or, at the most, each family, goes out as a unit, to settle where he will and seek his fortune as he can, was unknown. It is a new phenomenon in the world, and, on its present gigantic scale, a phenomenon only of yesterday. Although it has very lately spread to a considerable extent in Germany, it was before almost confined to the British islands. Yet, even here, it had its origin within the lifetime of men scarcely yet beyond middle age. The Government returns show that in 1815 the emigrants to all parts of the world were only 2,081. In the years of distress which followed the peace they increased rapidly. In 1816 they were 12,510 ; 20,634 in 1817 ; 27,989 in 1819. Since that it has almost uniformly increased, until, in ten years after the potato famine of 1846, the emigration from the United Kingdom alone amounted to 2,618,650. The two circumstances to be specially noted are, that of the whole European emigration, by far the greatest part has been from the British islands (in 1857, for instance, England supplied 50,289 ; Ireland, 71,195 ; Scotland, 8,161, and the rest of Europe only 6,414, most of whom came from Germany), and that it has taken place to a most disproportionate degree in the last few years. No one who knows how much it is our national habit to leave things to take care of themselves, can wonder that such has, on the whole, been the course with the emigration ; and considering the enormous demands upon the charity of



Catholics in particular, it is little wonderful that they have not yet undertaken it. And yet it cannot be doubted that many a great and glorious opportunity has already been let slip. Who can say what seeds of future good would already have been sown; what Catholic communities would already have rising in America and Australia, had any organization been in operation, before the terrible rush from Ireland in the years following 1848, for the systematic settlement of Catholic emigrants in situations where they would have been subjected to Catholic influences. But much may still be done; and we trust that the exertions which Mr. Formby is making to call attention to the subject, may secure that it will not be left undone. It is obvious that in the bishops seated throughout the British colonies and the United States, and in the religious communities which are planted both in the Old and the New World, Catholics possess the best possible materials for such an organization.

---

*The Irish Ecclesiastical Record.* June, 1867. Dublin: Fowler.

WE have not happened to see regularly this monthly periodical, which is fast approaching its fortieth issue. But there has been pointed out in its June number a paper which bears on a matter of such grave practical importance that we are very desirous of bringing it before our readers' notice. We hope they will obtain the number in question, and study the article to which we refer.

It is written by an Irish priest, who, after long experience of practical work in his native country, has settled in America. Its object is—(1) to mention the deplorable "falling off of Irish Catholics" which the writer considers to take place "in the United States;" and (2) to investigate the causes of this fact. We have no opinion of our own on the matter, not having means of forming one; but we will give a general account of the writer's allegation.

"Many think," he says—and he himself evidently inclines to the opinion—"that the losses" of the Church in America "are greater in proportion to our number than they ever were before" (p. 433). He says that, though American Catholics who have been educated in Ireland very seldom apostatize, yet the case is most widely different with their children. These almost invariably, when they cease to *practise* their religion, cease to *profess* it. They do not, indeed, ordinarily profess infidelity, but they profess indifferentism, and disclaim the name of Catholic. "The number who are sinking into the mass I have described is truly frightful" (p. 435).

"At home they receive their religious convictions from the community in which they live; they find them almost in the atmosphere of the country, which contains nothing but Protestantism and Catholicity, and they easily spurn the former. Here the atmosphere that such persons breathe is impregnated with this spirit of 'no religion,' and they grow up accordingly. If the first generation of this kind retain some slight inkling of the Catholicity of their fathers, even that is blotted out in the next. What becomes of them after is a matter of chance. This is the process by which the Church sustains



most of her losses in this country. It would be frightful were I to state the extent to which they reach beyond all doubt."

The parents themselves who come from Ireland remain Catholics, yet have very great faults. They are extremely indifferent to the duty of giving their children a Catholic education.

"They will place their young where they are not only without instruction, but exposed to all kinds of evil influences. At one time they flatter themselves they are too young to receive bad impressions, at another that they are too firm to be influenced. At another time they look forward to bringing them to the priest as a remedy for the evil that may occur. Protestants laugh at their simplicity, and take advantage of it. Before these foolish parents realize the danger, the evil done is beyond remedy, and then they will console themselves by saying that they are not responsible. The same thing holds good in dangers to morals as in dangers to faith.

"The Germans who have any pretensions to faith, act much better in this respect. Generally speaking, they no more think of sending their children to any but Catholic schools, than they would to any but Catholic churches. They give all that is necessary to support them. They are satisfied with what can be obtained for the time being. Hence the schools improve by degrees, and a Catholic school is almost an invariable appendage to a German Catholic church.

"But unless the priest can establish at once a school that will meet all their views, *our Irish people can scarcely be induced to avail themselves of it.* Even if the school be unexceptionable, to avoid the little that is required to be paid, or to form American connections, *vast numbers are sent elsewhere.* Hence irreparable injury and additional difficulty in providing means to remedy the evil in future."

It might be expected from this, and the writer considers it to be true, that the parents in their domestic circle trouble themselves extremely little with the religious instruction of their children.

"Many of them speak little of religion, except in a general manner, nor of duties, except to complain of some glaring fault. They are taught that they are Catholics, and little more. To speak of the claims of God, of the examples of the saints, of love for the practices of religion, is left to the priest or the sister, or is done only by those who are prompted by special fervour. The consequence is, that *the mass of our children grow up without any practical religious training.* Many of the substitutes which supply the parent's deficiencies in Ireland are here wanting; the children remain as tabule rase, and *numbers grow up like so many baptized heathens.*

"No wonder that, in moving from place to place, *all recollection of the faith is lost, at least in the succeeding generations.*"

The writer adds (p. 438) that all this "happens among Irish emigrants to a far greater degree than amongst any other, having an equal or any fair degree of earnest faith." He admits fully, of course, that the priests in America are those directly called on to cope with this evil; but he inquires whether much may not also be done for that purpose by priests in Ireland. It would be very far better, he thinks, for the great majority of Irish emigrants to America if they staid at home; but they *will* emigrate; and the question is, how they can best be so trained at home as to be secure against the spiritual dangers which they will thus incur. He urges the importance

of their education being such that its result may continue, "independently of the peculiar circumstances in which they happen to be placed at this moment in Ireland." Let the priests, he says—

"Use all the aids with which their peculiar situation is yet happily provided, to plant deeply not only the faith, but *the habits that will protect it under trials, and make it fructify*, and let these be so planted as to be able to stand as much as possible by themselves, and not need the props by which they are surrounded for the present at home, and their people will go forth ready to contend with the trials of other countries with a well-founded hope of coming out victorious."

In particular, he earnestly wishes that Irish Catholics were urged to approach the Sacraments, especially that of Penance, at a much earlier age than is now common; that family devotion and family instruction were peculiarly encouraged; that the parents were pressed to co-operate more actively with the priest in their children's education than is now commonly the case.

We may further add, though the writer before us does not allude to this, that the advance now made in secular instruction and intellectual cultivation is a most important element to be taken into account. We will not here debate whether this advance is a good or an evil: at all events it is an accomplished fact. And it is plain that the method of effectively imparting religious truth must be very different, accordingly as its recipients are or are not possessed of considerable intellectual cultivation.

Even if the writer's statements are exaggerated, and to whatever extent they may be exaggerated, he will have done very important service by drawing attention to so momentous a matter.

---

*A Few Words on Church Choirs and Church Music*, by Canon FREDERICK OAKELEY, M.A., Missionary Rector of S. John's, Islington. London: Printed for the author, and sold by Burns, Oates, & Co., 17, Portman Street, and 63, Paternoster Row.

THE publication of Canon Oakeley, of which we give the title, if it be the least of the author's productions as to quantity, is by no means the least as to real value. It handles briefly, but wisely and effectively, one of those matters pertaining to our public services which, though at first sight it may appear little more than a question of taste and arrangement, is nevertheless one which enters largely into the life of our practical system, and may be said even to touch upon issues of considerable moment in a religious and social point of view. More especially is this the case in these days of awakened intelligence among all classes, and when the problem of how we can best attach the rising generation of educated youth to the faith and worship of the Church has become one of anxious difficulty to all earnest and thoughtful Catholics. We have here of course in view what Canon Oakeley himself describes as the main point of his essay,—viz. *the importance of training our*

*Catholic boys to take part in the public Choral Offices of the Church*, and as regards a select portion of them, to sustain those parts in the performance of the higher kinds of choir music which in this country have, for want of a system of chorister-training, been very generally confided to female singers. We must refer our readers to the Canon's Essay itself for a full statement of the grounds on which he bases his suggestions, which we cannot but think will be found of great cogency. The few remarks we propose to offer will be made with the double object of recommending the views of the author, and of suggesting one or two additional points of a practical kind, which, we trust, may be worth considering in the event of his plans coming to be—as we hope may be the case—generally acted upon.

It seems to us, then, we confess, that whatever reasons of necessity or expediency may have existed in past times for the employment of women singers in our choirs, the adoption of the more ecclesiastical mode of performance upon which Canon Oakeley insists ought henceforth to be considered a part of that movement towards a more perfect state of things which was inaugurated by the establishment of the hierarchy, and which has already in so many other respects brought us nearer in spirit and practice to our brethren in Catholic countries. Our author forcibly remarks on the want of harmony with Catholic tradition and practice, as exemplified to this day in the rest of Christendom, which has hitherto prevailed among us in this matter ; and we may add that, considering the vast advances which education has made among us, and the numerous pupils of our schools who receive what is really a high class training (witness our fifth and sixth standard books, with their poetry and other lessons), there seems no reason whatever why we should not now begin to lay the foundation of a better system. This foundation may be said to consist—(1) In a complete system of general musical instruction in all our schools, especially those of boys. (2) In the special musical training of a select number of those boys. The first point secures ability in all to join in the congregational and popular services of our churches : the second provides for the wants of the choir properly so called. Let us glance briefly at a few of the advantages we should gain by carrying out the plan thus sketched.

1. We should secure for our youth the civilizing and elevating influence which would naturally follow from their being enabled to join intelligently in our public services. Were this not so generally admitted by all who have thought seriously on the subject, it would be easy to support the statement by testimonies of the wisest educators of youth, from Wykeham and Waynflete downwards ;—for on this head we need go no farther than our own country and our own Catholic ancestors.

2. The hold which the services of the Church would have upon the young in after-life would be very great. They would retain their interest in, and their love for them, and as adults they would be willing to assist in the offices of religion wherever they might be placed, either as members of the choir, or, what is hardly of less importance, joining their voices in the hymns and chants of the congregation. We shall show later on that we suppose a moral as well as musical training to be a necessary condition for such a result.

3. Closely connected with this, and partly arising out of it, would be a

greater relish of what is good in all ways ; greater self-respect in its best sense ; higher tastes and aspirations,—which would tend to exclude the material and sensual tendencies, now so much deplored among our young men ;—and with all this a fitness for uniting in any good works of a practical kind which the parochial clergy, with whom they would now be brought into much more tangible connection, might set before them.

So far mainly as regards the young themselves. Then, in addition, how much more decorous and edifying a sight would our choirs present,—Catholic boys and men rendering their part of the service in visible connection with the Altar and Clergy, instead of an assemblage of men and women of all religions, or no religion, carrying on a musical performance almost as a thing apart,—scarcely considering themselves in the church at all ; and too often, alas, behaving in a manner, to say the least of it, most disedifying to the worshippers who happen to be near them. And once more, how much should we not gain in the fulness and completeness of our ritual offices, by having men\* and boys at our command, instead of performers, who, whatever their good conduct, are incapacitated by their sex from taking part in the service.† Canon Oakeley has illustrated this part of the subject so felicitously and so convincingly, that we will only refer our readers to his pages ; and so pass on to one or two practical suggestions which arise from what has been said. To these we venture to request the attention of the thoughtful reader.

1. Besides the musical training of our youth, it is of the highest importance that *moral training and supervision should go hand in hand with it*. Rather we would say, that, without this, the other will be of questionable value. With regard to the young persons to whom we have alluded as taking part in the service with the general congregation, they will of course be subject to such general supervision and guidance as may be afforded by the charitable institutions of their parish and the influence of those above them,—but as regards those who may be chosen as choristers, we consider that a very special care should be exercised over them, and we do so in the confidence that it will be amply repaid.‡ Experience has justified the expectation that out of such a care and training the character of many a good Catholic layman would be formed ; and surely, at the present time, when the want of a Catholic middle class is increasingly felt, such a result would be of peculiar value. Nay, we do not doubt that in many cases, if due care were taken, even higher vocations would be elicited.

2. We think that the good effect to be derived from this change in the material of our choirs will hardly be realized unless we at the same time improve the *locale* of the singers. In this respect we have been equally out

---

\* We hear complaints of the difficulty of procuring Catholic men singers. Whence this difficulty ? *Because we do not train boys*. This is the whole secret, and it shows us, moreover, the only possible way out of the difficulty.

† We should also, we imagine, gain something in another way. With properly instructed choristers, should we have our ears afflicted with the mincing *Koireoi eloisons* and *Et Keum spiriteu teuos*, which we believe are the usual renderings of these words by our lady performers ?

‡ We could enforce this remark, if necessary, by adducing cases in which very sad results have followed from the *want* of such moral supervision.

of harmony with Ecclesiastical tradition and practice ; and if we are to save ourselves from disappointment with our choristers, we must make up our minds to give them the advantage of all the sacred associations which that system provides. In other words we must substitute a proper choral arrangement in connection with the Sanctuary for that now prevailing, and with which so many abuses are unhappily connected. There need, we think, be no practical difficulty about this, and we would suggest it as a matter worthy of serious consideration by our clergy and Catholic architects who are about to build or restore churches. The time is surely gone by for the stereotyped plan of an east-end with an altar under a large window, flanked by a smaller altar on either side, involving of course the impossibility of making any provision for the proper choral arrangements. Several instances might be adduced of churches recently erected in which the beautiful and convenient feature of side altars has been introduced, thus allowing the choir to occupy the chancel, —the organ of course being placed at the side, and ample space being still left for the Sanctuary. We should say that even in cases where boys cannot be at once procured for the choir it is very inadvisable to plan a building in such a way as to preclude a proper arrangement afterwards. Even a mixed choir can be accommodated *pro tempore* at the side of the chancel and contiguous to the organ ; a plan, by the by, which would go far towards securing that decorum among the singers, which the clergy find it quite impossible to enforce when they are placed at so great a distance as a west-end gallery.\*

We have left ourselves little space for remarks on the latter part of Canon Oakeley's Essay, but this is of less consequence since something to the same effect has before been said in the pages of the "DUBLIN REVIEW," and since moreover he himself speaks of it as but a subordinate part of his Essay. Indeed we do not imagine that there is now much difference of opinion on this part of the subject as far as the main principle is concerned. All would be ready to admit (1) that the foundation of choral service, as of musical education, must be laid in a thorough knowledge of the Church chant. If any doubt existed as to this, the testimony of many of the greatest musicians might be adduced in support of it.† (2) That this is not to be the *exclusive* study, but that every style and school of music, and such compositions of the several styles as can be legitimately employed for the adornment of the divine Offices and the edification

---

\* It may not be amiss to remark for the benefit of those who are promoting popular singing that the arrangement above referred to will be found highly conducive to that object. People take more interest, and join more readily in the singing, when they have the organ and leading singers before them and as it were in the midst of them.

† Perhaps some of our difficulties have actually arisen from the inadequate attention bestowed upon this point. Our author—a most impartial witness—says, "I venture to think that at this present moment it is not so much the ornate style of music which needs to be defended and pushed forward as the study and practice of Plain Chant." (*Few Words, &c.*, p. 29.) But for any real remedy for the present neglect of the Ritual Chant we must look to the heads of our Colleges, who we have reason to believe are now awakening to a sense of the great importance of this subject both as regards Church and lay students.

of the faithful should be cultivated. The only difference here would be as to whether this or that piece of music were suitable for the purpose of public performance in church, and, if so, whether legitimately applied to particular occasions—whether again in a composition beautiful and attractive in a musical point of view, the treatment of the text \* and the adaptation of the musical phrases to the feeling of the passage were such as to make it advisable in a service where above all others—musicians themselves being judges—far greater attention to these points is required than in the setting of secular words. The case is of course quite different when we have merely a kind of musical recitation to deal with like that of the Plain Chant, where the feeling of the words is supposed to be brought out by the devotion of the worshipper rather than by the character of the melody ;—and we can therefore understand how a tasteful ear,—satisfied it may be with the Plain Chant because it pretends to no more than it fulfils, and at least leaves the worshipper free to follow his own devotional feelings,—might be offended by many a fine composition,—not because, unlike the Plain Chant, it has the advantage of expression, but simply because the expression is felt to be of the *wrong kind*. A jiggling or rollicking Kyrie, *e. g.*—the musical phrases of which, if performed in a Music Hall, to other words, would give the greatest pleasure—might in the circumstances we have supposed be simply *distasteful*. The judgment of the mere musician would here coincide with the religious instinct.

Some persons (to allude for a moment in this connection to another of Canon Oakeley's points) have associated the use of orchestral instruments with music of an unsuitable character for Church use, and hence much of the prejudice he endeavours to combat. The use of an orchestra, however, where music of a kind suited to the sense of the words is employed, can only tend to increase its effect, so that if there is anything to be deprecated, it is not the use of the instruments, but the music upon which they are employed. On all such questions, however, as choice of music, &c., much latitude must always be conceded, and for ourselves we do not doubt that, from the advancing taste of the day, and the many means afforded for hearing and judging which everyone now possesses, such a general agreement will be arrived at as will both secure the sacred character of our services and at the same time satisfy the highest claims of art.

It will not, we hope, be gathered from anything we have said that we have any desire to undervalue the use of artistic music in divine service. On the contrary, we place the highest possible value upon it ; and we think its adoption for Church purposes especially important in these days when musical knowledge is so generally diffused. All we contend for is that singers should be adequately trained, and that the top-stone should not be brought †

\* It would perhaps be worth considering whether the Roman Vicar-General's order to which Canon Oakeley refers might not furnish some useful guidance upon the above mentioned point also. Possibly, if judged by its terms, some of our popular pieces would have to be excluded from the repertoires of our choirs, or very greatly modified.

† A word on another point may prevent misunderstanding. By "Plain Chant" we do not mean the barbarous stuff which sometimes goes by the



into requisition before the foundations of the edifice have been properly laid.

In parting with Canon Oakeley's essay, we feel that we should be unjust if we did not allude more particularly to one ground on which he may specially rest his claim to be heard on such a subject as this, and that is his *own success*. No one, *e.g.*, can attend on a Sunday evening at S. John's, Islington, without being greatly struck with the life and beauty of the whole service from first to last. It is not, indeed, every two priests that will be able to produce a result like those of S. John's (though in most missions the calling in of efficient musical aid would meet any practical difficulty), but we have now large religious *communities* settled in or near London—Dominicans, Passionists, Carmelites, &c., and to them we confidently look for the training up of bodies of choristers, and of young men, who shall both be apt and reverent assistants in the offices of the sanctuary, and also in due time the ornament and strength of the Church in their several places in society. These communities have both the time and the hands necessary for such a task, and among the many good works of our day we submit that this may fairly take its place as one of the most important.

---

*Letters in the Tablet of July 13 and Oct. 19, 1867, signed a "ROMAN DOCTOR OF DIVINITY."*

THIS writer complains in October that we have seriously misunderstood his letter of July. We are bound therefore, either to apologize for our misrepresentation, or else to show that we faithfully exhibited the legitimate objective sense of his first letter. Our allegations were two in number, and shall now be successively defended.

Firstly, we said (Oct., p. 358) that he "considers the Church as unable to pronounce infallibly on such questions as those of ontologism and psychologism;" and on this head he does not profess that we misunderstood him. We pointed out in reply (p. 360): that "the Roman Congregations have pronounced again and again" on ontologism; a circumstance, we added, which "proves to demonstration that in the Holy Father's judgment those questions are really connected with the Deposit." To this we will here add one further fact on which we have spoken in an earlier notice. The Pope has himself condemned Professor Ubaghs on the very ground of his having advocated ontologistic tenets, similar to those of which the Holy Office had pronounced that "they cannot safely be taught." It is most certain therefore that Pius IX. considers the tenets of ontologism to have a real bearing on the Deposit; and the further question whether he is infallible in his judgment

---

name, and which is sung (if the word be not misapplied) by persons who have neither been trained in it, nor know anything of its nature or capabilities.



on those tenets resolves itself into the general inquiry, whether he is infallible on all matters connected with the Deposit.

It is our *second* allegation, against which the "Roman Doctor" has so vehemently protested. In his letter to F. Ryder, Dr. Ward referred to "the vast mass of philosophical truth" infallibly "taught by the condemnation of Hermes, of Günther, of traditionalistic error, and the like" (p. 29); and the "Roman Doctor" accounted this a "startling statement."\* Now there were two different grounds on which he may have accounted this statement startling. He may have thought on one hand that these philosophical pronouncements are not infallible; or he may have thought on the other hand, that, though infallible, they do not teach a "vast mass of philosophical truth." We ascribed to him the former view; and that, for the very simple reason that he had himself expressed it. In the 6th paragraph of his letter he "denies" that "the Pope claims to speak infallibly outside the Deposit." But, he adds, "while I deny it, I do not forget what matters have been dealt with in Encyclicals during the last fifty years; . . . such as . . . *metaphysical matters, &c.*" "I really believe," however, "that the Pontiff, *speaking in these Encyclicals*, does not wish to be bound only to speak when he is in a position to speak infallibly; but that *oftentimes he speaks authoritatively without speaking infallibly.*" Our opponent then denied the Holy Father's infallibility in certain authoritative declarations on "metaphysical matters." But the Pope's authoritative declarations "on metaphysical matters" are one and all contained in his "condemnation of Hermes, of Günther, of traditionalistic error, and the like." It is evident therefore, that our opponent denied the Holy Father's infallibility in certain of these condemnations; and this is the precise opinion which we ascribed to him.

However it has happened to many able writers, that they have failed occasionally to express their exact meaning; and if the "Roman Doctor" had contented himself with assuring the world that such had been his lot in the present instance, we should have been most happy to insert his disclaimer and there make an end. But he has written in a very different tone; for this is his letter of October 13:—

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE TABLET.

"SIR,—Will you kindly allow a little space wherein a 'Roman Doctor' may defend his orthodoxy, which is suspected in an article on 'Minor Doctrinal Judgments' in the current number of the *Dublin Review*.

---

\* Immediately after mentioning it, he adds, "but the most startling statement of all is, &c.:" implying of course, that the preceding statements were startling, though not so much so as that which followed. This "most startling statement of all" is, that Catholics are carefully to consider "the degree of private judgment permissible in studying secular science." Our opponent cannot have been more startled by our proposition, than we were by his objection to it. Pius IX., in his Munich Brief, expressly teaches that "Catholic students" of the natural sciences "must ever have Divine revelation before their eyes as a guiding star, under whose light they may be saved from quicksands and errors." Now if this be so, it must be false and dangerous to hold that unlimited "private judgment" is "permissible" in these studies.

"It is not what you will say, but what people will say you have said, that I fear," observed a friend, advising me to write in this controversy under a *nom de plume*. And the following passage fully justified the caution:—"He" (the Roman Doctor) "adds the expression of amazement at our opinion that a "vast mass of philosophical truth was taught by the condemnation of Hermes and Günther"—meaning, apparently, that he disbelieves the infallibility of those censures." (*Vid.* Article, p. 358.)

"The sentence is certainly characteristic; and would go far to convince one that there was as much justice as humour in the motto of a certain recent pamphlet. Of course, if I am not at the one extreme, of believing that a vast mass of philosophical truth was taught by the censures, why then I am 'apparently,' at the other, of denying their infallibility. Verily, 'the middle thou never knewest!' I never doubted that the Pontiff could pronounce an infallible judgment on a metaphysician who should deny Catholic dogma, or even upon a physician who should maintain (suppose) that quinine was a remedy for original sin. But as to Dr. Ward's statement that a vast mass of philosophical truth was taught by the censures, I believe it to be just as true as if one should say that a vast mass of ethical philosophy (meaning the Ten Commandments) was taught by the Church's condemnations of immoral literature. And I am amazed that Dr. Ward should indulge in such assertions (for there are others of similar character), which can only be explained by being explained away; and which, I will add, are calculated to convey to Protestants and ill-instructed Catholics a false notion of the nature and office of our holy religion. I cannot find in the Church's condemnation of philosophers any assertion of new, but only republication of the old dogma against those who deny it. Nor can I find that she teaches any merely philosophical truth whatsoever.

"As to Dr. Ward's citation against me, and his reminder of 'the Roman Pontiff's judgment on such a matter,' I can only say that they are nothing to his purpose; for it is not his citations, but his own statements which contradict mine. The thunders of the Vatican are friendly to me, who am heart and soul with the Holy Father against his enemies of every description—amongst whom I also number his injudicious friends.

"I am sir,

"Faithfully yours,

"A ROMAN DOCTOR OF DIVINITY."

In his former letter he had said that, on "metaphysical matters" inclusively, the Pope "often speaks authoritatively without speaking infallibly." And now, because we believed him to mean what he distinctly said, he protests that our criticism can only have proceeded from one, who "never knew the middle of humanity, but only the extremity of both ends."

We think our readers will agree with us, that the general tone of this second letter is quite indefensible, unless three conditions had concurred: unless (1) he himself possessed a clear and definite view on the point at issue; unless (2) that view were in plain accordance with the general judgment of theologians; and unless (3) our own view were in direct opposition to theirs. But even the former of these conditions is not here realized. One portion of his first letter contradicts another portion; and his second letter contradicts his first. In order to show this, it will be necessary to state the three different theories which have been recently expressed, on the object-matter of infallibility.

The first theory would confine infallibility within the sphere of the actual Deposit; of immediately revealed dogmata.

The second theory extends infallibility to what has recently been called the "virtual" Deposit; to those truths which flow *by necessary consequence* from revealed dogmata. (See our October number, p. 351.)

The third theory—the only one (we maintain) consistent with the Church's teaching and with the language of theologians—extends infallibility much further; viz. to all truths, of whatever kind, directly or indirectly connected with the Deposit. According to this view, the Church has the power of infallibly condemning any error, which is *injurious in any way whatsoever* to the Deposit and to the salvation of souls. (See our October number, pp. 345, 353.)

F. Ryder adopts the second of these three views: while the "Roman Doctor," though intending to defend F. Ryder, oscillates between the first and third. In various portions of his first letter he adopts the former view. "*The strict limit of infallibility is the Deposit.*" "That the Pontiff claims to speak infallibly in matters outside the Deposit *I do not believe.*" And the same, as our readers have seen, is the doctrine of his second letter. But in another portion of his first letter his language is very different; and we will reprint a few sentences, that our readers may judge on the matter for themselves.\* They are from the 6th paragraph; and the italics are our own.

He denies "that the Pontiff claims to speak infallibly outside the Deposit."

"And while I deny it," he adds, "I do not forget what matters have been dealt with in Encyclicals within the last fifty years; such as the Pope's temporal sovereignty, 'so-called' religious liberty, the liberty of the press, the State's office in matters concerning religion, the relations between theological and secular science, metaphysical matters, &c. It would require a volume to treat of these matters in detail, nor does Dr. Ward so treat them. I can only say in general (1) that a large portion of such matters directly infringes on the Deposit; and upon this the Pontiff speaks infallibly of course. (2) That a still larger portion *is more or less closely connected with the Deposit*; and here the Pontiff *speaks infallibly* as far as the censure goes, i.e. that which he says is dangerous or scandalous is dangerous or scandalous. (3) That I can conceive, indeed I really believe, that the Pontiff speaking in these Encyclicals does not wish to be bound only to speak when he is in a position to speak infallibly, but that oftentimes he speaks authoritatively without speaking infallibly, e.g., for the purpose of repressing purulent speculation in religious matters."

Firstly then, our opponent accounts the Pontiff infallible in condemning what "infringes on the Deposit;" and so far, he only repeats what he has said before. But secondly, he considers him infallible on all matters "*more or less closely connected with the Deposit.*" On such matters, he adds, "that which the Pontiff says is dangerous or scandalous, *is* dangerous or scandalous;" and in like manner, what the Pontiff denounces as "*false*" is infallibly false; and what the Pontiff describes as an "*error*" is infallibly an error. (See our October number, p. 347.) But this is absolutely the whole doctrine for which this Review has ever contended, on the object-matter of infallibility. Let him only adhere to what is here said, and on this part of

---

\* His first letter is unfortunately far too long to be reprinted entire.

the subject there will remain no controversy whatever between him and ourselves. Yet, immediately afterwards he reverts to his old idea, that infallibility is confined to the Deposit itself.

"Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?"

In the last portion of the above extract our opponent advocates an opinion, which perhaps may be accounted the most eccentric of all elicited by the controversy. He considers that the Holy Father "oftentimes" speaks "authoritatively," though not "infallibly," on matters wholly unconnected with the Deposit.\* Nay, in the following paragraph he adds that "a cordial assent" is "required" from the faithful to such pronouncements, and not a mere "external submission"; but that such cordial interior assent is not to be "of a doctrinal character," "if he may so express himself." If we had ventured to say that the Pontiff requires interior assent to propositions wholly unconnected with the Deposit, we should not very soon have heard the last of it. And certainly it is curious, that one who advocates such an opinion as this, should charge *another* controversialist with singularity and eccentricity.

However, in his first letter he does preserve consistency on one point. He consistently advocates that opinion which we ascribed to him; viz. that the "authoritative" instruction even of Encyclicals is "oftentimes" not "infallible." But even this consistency is abandoned in his second letter. According to his October convictions, all Catholics "suspect" his "orthodoxy," who imagine that he can regard the censures passed on Hermes and Günther as otherwise than infallible. Now Günther was censured, not even in an Encyclical, but in an Apostolic Letter addressed to the Archbishop of Cologne.

In his short second letter he has contrived to introduce another statement also, directly inconsistent with what he had advocated before. He had said before, that the Pontiff "oftentimes" speaks "authoritatively," though not "infallibly," on "metaphysical matters" wholly unconnected with the Deposit. But now he "cannot find" that "she teaches any *merely* philosophical truth whatsoever;" any philosophical truth which is not "more or less closely connected" with the Deposit. For ourselves, of course, we here heartily concur, not with his earlier, but with his later opinion.

At the end of his letter he warmly protests his full agreement with "the Roman Pontiff's judgment on such a matter." Certainly it is difficult to imagine any proposition whatever on the subject, with which *one or other* of his various statements will not be in harmony. In October he says for the first time, that such an Apostolic Letter as that which condemned Günther is indubitably infallible; nay, and that no one is "orthodox" who thinks otherwise. Let him only steadfastly adhere to this opinion and carry it out to its legitimate consequences; in such case we shall be the last to cite against him any Pontifical judgment whatever. Meanwhile we hope he will ponder the various references in our present number to the condemnation of Hermesianism, traditionalism, and ontologism.

In the next issue of the *Tablet* appeared the following letter from Dr. Ward:—

\* We say "wholly unconnected": because if they are not "more or less closely connected," they must be wholly unconnected therewith.

## "TO THE EDITOR OF THE TABLET.

"SIR,—As I have more than once explained, it will be far more convenient in every respect that I should reserve for the *Dublin Review* my answer to objections made in your columns. I will not, therefore, in this letter, attempt reply to the 'Roman Doctor of Divinity.'

"But one of his expressions might lead to a complete misapprehension of what I have said. He denies that the Church 'teaches any merely philosophical truth whatever;' where, by the phrase '*merely philosophical truth*,' I understand him to mean 'philosophical truth unconnected with faith and morals.' Your readers might suppose, from his thus speaking, that I am at issue with him on this matter: but such is by no means the case.

"My thesis, repeatedly expressed, is simply this. The Church has the power of infallibly condemning any philosophical error, which she may judge to be injurious in any way whatsoever to the Deposit of Faith or to the salvation of souls. I need hardly add, that in condemning an error she teaches its contradictory truth.

"It will be of great service towards our mutual understanding, if your correspondent will kindly say whether he agrees with this statement; or otherwise, in what particular he dissents from it. His letter seems to me far from clear, if he will allow me to say so, as to his positive opinions.

"It will also avert further misapprehension, if he will tell me whether I rightly understood him, as maintaining in his former letter, that the question between ontologism and psychologism is external to the Church's power of infallible determination. He has been silent on this point in his present letter.

"I may add finally, that the sentence of my published letter, on which the 'Roman Doctor' commented in July, referred (p. 29) to 'the vast mass of philosophical truth taught by the condemnation of Hermes, of Günther, of traditionalistic error, and the like.' though undoubtedly in October, for brevity's sake, I omitted the words which I have now italicised.

"I remain, Sir, faithfully yours,

"W. G. WARD."

To this appeal the "Roman Doctor" made no response. We know not how otherwise to interpret his reticence than by one supposition. He found, we infer, when he came to examine his own meaning, that he had in real truth not fairly given his mind to the matter in hand, and that no definite answer to Dr. Ward's question was producible. This is the obvious inference, we think, to be deduced from that reply, which was "conspicuous by its absence." It is certainly the inference which we deduce from those two letters which he did write.

---

*The Theories of Copernicus and Ptolemy.* By a Wrangler. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1867.

IN this brochure the writer raises the question whether or not Galileo was supported by rigorous scientific proofs when he held "with so much tenacity" the orbital and diurnal motions of the earth.

At the very outset one asks oneself what is meant by rigorous scientific proofs. It is known and admitted by all tolerably well-informed students that Galileo failed to support his theory by adequate arguments, and that he

did not get beyond the region of shrewd and enlightened guess-work. It is allowed by those who accept his theory, that he utterly failed in his "scientific proofs," or, as some would say, in his "mathematical demonstrations." But what is meant by scientific proof, or by the stronger phrase of mathematical demonstration? Is any proof scientific in any other sense than as it is logical? and is there any mathematical form of demonstration at all? We venture very humbly to suggest that there is not. If anything is proved or demonstrated, it is done logically, and not mathematically or mechanically, nor even astronomically. The premisses may be propositions in astronomy, medicine, or astronomy, but the use made of them for the purposes of inference must be logical—not physical or mathematical. There is no certain or absolute inference outside "Barbare, Celerent, &c.," with the extension due to a quantified predicate pointed out by Hamilton and Professor de Morgan. But by "scientific proof" is ordinarily meant *not* a scientific proof, in the sense that the proof is logical, but what appears at the time, and in the state of the student's knowledge, a preponderating probability. In fact the inductive method can never establish any nearer approximation to certainty than a very high degree of probability. We now know that Galileo failed to establish this high degree of probability, and that the most that can be said of his theory of physical astronomy by those who now receive it, is that he came to a right conclusion on quite insufficient evidence. The "Wrangler" goes a step further, and maintains that the proofs which have since been alleged, and generally admitted—notably the aberration of light and the parallax of the fixed stars—are also insufficient, as proofs of the Copernican theory. In this he is undoubtedly right, if proof is understood as meaning certain or logical proof, of which the subject is incapable. No doubt but that the *experimentum crucis* has a great effect on the mind in inclining it towards the theory which it supports. Thus the theory of universal gravitation was undoubtedly greatly strengthened by the discovery of Neptune as a consequence of the solution by M. Leverrier and Mr. Adams of the inverse problem of the three bodies. But the theory was only strengthened, not demonstrated. The history of science is in fact abundantly supplied with crucial experiments in support of a theory which further observations have condemned. There is probably no theory of physical action more fanatically believed in by those who have confined the application of their mental powers to the study of physics than the theory of universal gravitation; yet there are many phenomena which have not been brought within it.

Our author feels it necessary, in support of his view that the Copernican theory has not yet been scientifically proved, to treat the phenomena of the aberration of light and the parallax of some of the fixed stars. He names only one star (61 Cygni), but we believe that a like phenomenon has been observed in the case of some other stars. We cannot think that he has treated either of these phenomena quite successfully, and, whilst we reject them as scientifically (*i.e.* logically) demonstrative, we think that if the theory of the orbital motion of the earth, which would satisfactorily account for them, be rejected, the theory of a proper motion of the fixed stars corresponding (so called popularly) to the earth's orbital motion must be



admitted, and that the fixity of the earth, *relatively to the sun*, will not, as seems to us to be our author's idea, account for those phenomena. If a man in London enters a railway carriage which appears to move, and finds himself at York in a certain time, we hold that if there is any distance between London and York, one of three things must have happened : either the carriage has passed over this distance, or, the carriage having been stationary, York has moved into the place formerly occupied by London, or else both the carriage and York have moved, and the result is that their combined motion has brought them together.

Our author appears to us to reason as if the relative changes of place between the carriage and York could be affected by the relative changes of place of a third body which has a motion relative to the railway carriage or to York. Thus, speaking of the aberration, which is a question purely between the fixed star (or supposed fixed star) and the moving (or supposed to be moving) earth, he seems to indicate that the relative displacements between the earth and the star can be affected by the motion or immovability of the sun.

Still "A Wrangler" is undoubtedly right in saying that "It is an axiom incontrovertible, that, in order to ascertain the absolute motion or rest of any body in space, we must at least find one fixed point, and one known fixed line passing through it ;" and again, when he says, "Now a point absolutely fixed has never been found or even suspected by any astronomer," if by astronomer he mean an astronomer of the modern school.

There can be little doubt that when "A Wrangler" proceeds to discuss the argument drawn from the greater simplicity of the Copernican system, he has good right to ask the question whether simplicity is "in itself a mark of truth." Simplicity, like probability itself, is in us, not in the relations of external objects. The theory of straight lines is far simpler than the theory of curves, yet it is no truer ; and we might have been so constituted, if it had pleased God, that the theory of curved lines would have been simpler and easier of comprehension than the theory of straight lines. So of the laws of the Universe ; they may be, could we know them, what, if we knew them, would appear to us complicated ; and it may be that the very highest degree of what would appear complexity to us would be simpler to a superior intelligence than what we deem simple.

"A Wrangler" will have done good service if he has succeeded in inspiring doubt of that which, however probable, still admits of doubt, and in so combating the unphilosophical fanaticism of the Galileo school of science.

The study of physics is prolific of theories, and, if pursued by men who, however well versed in the observation of phenomena, have not cultivated mental philosophy and theology, is apt to generate a most intolerant and offensive dogmatism and fanaticism. Theory after theory is exploded, but the newest or most universally received theory of the day is always true, and not only so, but any hesitation to receive it as a probable rather than a certain truth, is resented as high treason to the very narrow circle of knowledge within which the students of physics often, in fact generally, confine themselves. This is usually accompanied with a profound contempt for other and higher studies, and very often by an absolute rejection of all



higher and more certain truths. It is not without reason, and even necessity, that the Church claims the control of education, so as to instil true philosophy as a corrective to that knowledge which breeds arrogance and fanaticism.

The "Wrangler" has made no reference to the *theological* bearing of Galileo's scientific history; neither, therefore, do we in our notice make any such reference.

*Sunday Afternoons with the Saints.* By Rev. W. H. ANDERDON, M.A.

WE have received six numbers of this valuable little series. Their contents are brief narratives of the lives of S. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, S. Brigid, S. Alban, S. Francis Xavier, the martyrs of Japan, and S. John Nepomucene. Elegantly written, full of spirit and of simplicity, these slight works are calculated to do a great deal of good, by exciting the interest of young people, and leading them to desire a more full and extended knowledge of the marvels of grace which they narrate.

*Confession to a Priest.* By Rev. W. H. ANDERDON, M.A.

IT is unnecessary to dwell upon the circumstances which lend additional interest and importance to a little work which at any time would merit attention, and be found of much value to Catholics who are likely to be frequently called on to give a reason for the faith that is in them. Mr. Anderdon addresses his argument "to men of good will,"—persons who have honest, unprejudiced, but ignorant suspicions concerning the use and abuse of confession;—"not to the professed calumniator, who gets his bread by unwashed falsehood." He discusses the subject under two heads. 1. What confession is not. 2. What it does to society and to the individual. This little treatise is very ably written, and we hope many of its readers will act on the advice contained in the concluding paragraph:—"Let inquirers 'of good will' [we stick to our text] take this little tract to the first-instructed and practical Catholic, and say: 'Tell me, by your personal experience, *is it true?*' Then let them go on their knees and pray for grace to see the truth. Amen."

*In the Snow: Tales of Mount St. Bernard.* By Rev. W. H. ANDERDON, M.A. Burns, Oates, & Co.

THIS is a charming little volume, constructed on the popular Christmas system. A number of people are detained by an accident of travel, and they beguile the time by relating stories. In the present instance, humour, inventiveness, and a keen insight into the tastes and fancies of the young are united. Some of the stories which divert the travellers detained at Mount St. Bernard by the snow are beautiful, fanciful, and shrewd enough to claim fellowship with Hans Christian Andersen's famous creations "The College Fellows' MS.," a story told by a pair of gossiping swallows, might fairly rank with the family talk of the storks. The writer gives widely

varied specimens of nationality in these tales. Turkey and Denmark, Tunis and Tipperary, modern Italy and Pagan Rome are represented here ; and the bold, free ocean-life common to all. The frame-work inclosing these stories, is very ingenious and interesting, and altogether we have to congratulate Catholic parents and children on the appearance of a book which may be given by the former with advantage, and read by the latter with pleasure and edification.

---

*Oswald of Deira : a Drama.* By GEORGIANA LADY CHATTERTON, Author of "Leonore : a Tale ; and other Poems," &c. &c. Longmans.

LADY CHATTERTON has founded this remarkable poem in a dramatic form upon incidents in the life of Oswald of Deira, of whom Count de Montalembert makes mention in an eloquent passage in his "Monks of the West." How she has used the scanty materials furnished by history, enriching them by her imagination, realizing them by her sympathy, and reproducing them with all their accessories by her rare antiquarian knowledge, we can only indicate here. She has clothed the dry bones which rested for ages in "Ventacasta," and joined the long dead to the land and the time of the living, by the spell of that human drama in action which is never out of date. The character of Oswald—his manly simplicity, integrity, faith, courage, and power of influence—are finely brought out, and the dawn of Christian civilization spreads its peculiar atmosphere over the scene and the action. There is a passage in which the future of Winchester is foretold by the Venerable Hermengarde, mother of Cynegils the King, the prophecy being spoken in the old palace, afterwards the site of the grand cathedral, which is full of noble beauty. Oswald's confession of faith, and the Princess Elfrid's story—the old tradition on which the scheme of the drama is constructed—are each material points in this, Lady Chatterton's latest book, which is decidedly her best. "Oswald of Deira" has been written partly with the purpose of providing a drama fit for amateur representation, and there is only one reason why this purpose is not likely to be successful. We doubt whether amateurs could be induced to commit such rolling, sonorous, and occasionally difficult verse to memory. We do not doubt that this poem will recommend itself to all readers of elevated and cultivated taste.

---

WE notice with pleasure the considerable improvements and amendments made in the Catholic Directory for 1868, published by Messrs. Burns, Oates, & Co. Prefixed to the first part, is a valuable compendium of the different Patriarchates and Sees of the Catholic world. There is a useful collection of British Catholic statistics ; and a summary of recently passed Acts of Parliament affecting Catholic interests. All the usual information is fully and carefully given—in rather too great detail perhaps, as in the list of special services at some of the churches, by which whole pages are occupied with matter, the really useful pith of which might be given in a few lines, leaving room for the extension of the statistical and Roman departments, which is much to be desired.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS ON A PHILOSOPHICAL  
CONTROVERSY IN BELGIUM.\*

---

DE QUADAM PHILOSOPHICA DOCTRINA QUAM IN SUIS OPE-  
RIBUS DOCUIT DOCTOR DECURIALIS G. C. UBAGHS.

*Iam ab anno 1843 Sanctæ Sedi proposita sunt quædam opera philosophica G. C. Ubaghs Professoris in celebri Universitate catholica Lovaniensi, atque ab initio S. Congregatio Indicis quasdam propositiones nota dignas iudicavit atque sequens tradidit notationum folium.*

*Die 3. Iunii 1843.*

“Rev. D. Ubaghs in sua *Theodicea*, et interdum etiam in *Logica* subsequentes propositiones docet, quas Sacra Congregatio Indici præposita emendandas esse iudicat.”

I. “Haud posse nos in cognitionem cuiusvis externæ metaphysicæ veritatis venire (nempe quæ respiciat ea, quæ sub sensus nostros non cadunt) “absque alterius instructione, ac in ultima analysi absque divina revelatione.”

“Porro hæc doctrina admitti nequit, quia sciunt veritates internæ et mathematicæ cognosci possunt ope ratiocinii, ut ipsemet auctor fatetur, ita saltem possibile est veritates externas assequi, quotiescumque necessario cum internis connectuntur; aut cum ipsæ internæ consistere nequeunt non supposita aliqua veritate externa.”

II. “Veritates externas metaphysicas demonstrari proprie non posse,” (Vide Theod. pag. 220, n. 413 et seq.)

“Iamvero veritates externæ quandoque cum internis necessario copulantur, tanquam effectus cum causa, et ideo per hanc connexionem demonstrari possunt eo genere argumenti quod *a posteriori* vocatur, cuius certitudo non minor illa est, quæ per demonstrationem *a priori* obtinetur.”

III. “Dei existentiam minime demonstrari posse. Deum existere demonstrari posse negamus.” (Theod. pag. 73.)

“Quæ importuna doctrina ultro fluit ex opinionibus iam iudicatis ipsius auctoris.”

IV. “Probationes existentiae Dei reduci ad quamdam fidem, aut fundari “in hac fide, qua non tam videmus quam credimus, seu naturaliter persuasum “nobis est, ideam hanc esse fidelem, id quod evidentia mere interna cernere “non possumus.” (Theod. pag. 73.)

“Quæ verba significare videntur potius credi quam demonstrari Dei existentiam; quod quidem a vero omnino distat.”

---

\* See p. 237.

V. "Auctor omnes probationes veritatum externarum metaphysicarum *"reducit at sensum communem."*

"Quæ doctrina admitti nequit, eo quod aliquæ veritates externæ demonstrantur a posteriori per veritates internas, absque ulla relatione ad sensum communem. Ita habentes conscientiam nostræ existentiae directe inferimus existere causam, quæ nobis existentiam contulerit; seu ab una veritate interna deducimus aliam veritatem externam absque interventu sensus communis."

"Hæc sunt præcipuæ sententiæ, quæ in prædicto libro corrigendæ videntur. Monet igitur Sacra Congregatio Rev. Auctorem, ut nova aliqua editione librum suum emendandum curet; atque interim in scholasticis suis lectionibus ab iis sententiis docendis abstinere velit."

*Clarus Auctor ut animadversionibus S. Congregationis faceret satis, suamque doctrinam ab omni purgaret suspitione, libellum memorialem scripsit die 9 Decemb. 1843, quo a S. Congregatione Indicis in examen revocato, alterum quod sequitur traditum est notationum folium.*

*Die 8 Augusti 1844.*

"Pauca quædam loca in opere quod a cl. viro G. C. Ubaghs an. 1841, Lovanii editum est et inscribitur *Theodica*, seu *Theologicæ naturalis elementa*, adnotanda esse videntur, ut doctissimus auctor, additis quibusdam illustrationibus, obortas circa eiusdem operis intelligentiam difficultates e medio tollere possit. Ac 1<sup>o</sup>. quidem memoranda sunt illa quæ pag. 73 habentur de Dei existentia—Deum existere demonstrari posse negamus, sed id certo certius probari etiam atque etiam affirmamus—Omnis certe ambiguitas ex hoc loco tolleretur si post vocem *Demonstrari* adderetur a priori, quod conveniret cum iis quæ tradit auctor in *Logica* p. 114 edit. *tertia de demonstrationis divisione*, ubi ostendit contra Kantianos demonstrationem a posteriori, iure ac merito veram demonstrationem vocari—Auctor etiam ibid. p. 105 hæc habet—Demonstrare, si stricte intelligitur, idem est ac probare iudicium certo esse sicut effertur.—Nemo autem negabit probationes existentiae Dei eam vim habere, ut respondeant notioni strictæ demonstrationis quæ hic a cl. auctore traditur.

2<sup>o</sup>. "Ubi auctor ad examen vocat diversa argumentorum genera, quæ ad Dei existentiam demonstrandam afferri solent, quædam habet quæ observatione digna videntur: Theol. p. 86, de argumentis physicis loquens ait: 'Et licet tum recta ex rationalis naturæ nostræ impulsu etc. .... probari possit, eundem esse potentia et intelligentia vere infinita, illud tamen ex argumentis physicis solis et stricte spectatis secundum leges logicas effici nequit.' pag. 87, De argumentis quæ moralia dicuntur ita se exprimit: 'In his veram Dei infinitatem expresse contentam esse, strictis logicæ legibus nondum plane efficitur.' Additis porro quibusdam de argumentis ex ente infinito, concludit: 'fide naturali et spontanea quadam progressionem continuo suppleamus id quod ad accuratam Dei notionem concipiendam, et ad Dei veri existentiam plene probandam illi soli probationi logicæ, si strictissime acciperetur, deesse videretur.' Tandem p. 89 legimus: 'probabiles quidem coniecturas facere de prima causa vel de primis causis (nesciremus utique, utrum una aut plures dicendæ essent), deque earum proprietatibus possemus.' In his omnibus mens doctissimi auctoris paulo clarius explicanda videtur, ne quis inde occasionem sumat vim elevandi argumentorum quæ Dei existentiam demonstrant.

3<sup>o</sup>. "Clarissimus auctor, cap. 7, p. 3, Theod., profitetur se 'magis speciatim ac si fieri possit, paulo apertius declarare velle: ea quæ ad veritatem cognoscendam spectant.' Quædam tamen ibi leguntur, de quorum intelligentia dubitationes oriri possent: pag. 216 hæc habentur: 'veritatem internam

immediate cognoscere possumus, externam non sine interposita fide.' Et pag. 219 'necesse est...ut institutio aliena nobis manifestas faciat veritates quæ nec mere animi affectiones sunt, nec sub sensus nostros cadunt. Plura alia eiusdem generis ibi obvia sunt, quæ contra mentem auctoris forte in alienos sensus torqueri possent, et ad id adhiberi, ut vis humanæ rationis extenuaretur, et argumenta, quæ pro veritatibus externis demonstrandis adhibentur, ita infirmarentur, ut certitudinem illam minime afferrent, quæ in iis homini omnino necessaria est."

*Verum quamvis Auctor novas editiones confecisset, non tamen visus est a suæ doctrinæ principiis recessisse, et controversiæ iam antea exortæ, seriores sunt redditæ. Episcopi autem ut erant concordie studiosi, consilium cum Emo Cardinali Archiepiscopo Mechliniensi inierunt tuendæ pacis sedandæque controversiæ, donec definitivum de his doctrinis iudicium Sedes Apostolica proferre opportunum existimaret: hac de causa litteras scripserunt ad Magnificum Universitatis Rectorem die 31 Iulii 1861.*

*Interea quatuor Professores philosophica eiusmodi placita Cardinali De Andrea qui S. Congregationi Indicis tunc præerat die 1 Februarii 1860 iam exposuerant; qui nomine suo die 1 Martii eiusdem anni rescripsit: "Memorata doctrinam recte adnumerandam esse inter eas quæstiones, quæ a philosophis christianis libere in utram partem disputari possunt." Eiusmodi autem Cardinalis De Andrea litteræ, quæ perperam allegabantur (non enim erant S. Congregationis) controversiam magis excitarunt, neque dictæ Episcoporum Litteræ eam sedare valuerunt. Itaque nonnulli Episcopi a SSmo D. N. postularunt ne declarare gravaretur quid de his doctrinis esset sentiendum. Beatissimus Pater sequentes tradidit Litteras.*

DILECTO FILIO NOSTRO ENGELBERTO

S. R. E. PRESBYTERO CARDINALI STERKX, ARCHIEPISCOPO MECHLINIENSI,  
ET VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS EIUS SUFFRAGANEIS  
IN BELGIO EPISCOPIS,

PIUS PP. IX.

"Dilecte Fili Noster, ac Venerabiles Fratres, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

"Ad plurimas gravissimasque amaritudines, quibus, vel ab ipso supremi Nostri Pontificatus initio, et hisce asperrimis præsertim temporibus affligimur, accessit etiam dolor excitatus ex molestis quæstionibus istic exortis ob discrepantes opiniones de quibusdam principiis adhibitis in tradenda philosophica ac theologica scientia in Catholica Lovaniensi Universitate. Non levi autem consolatione affecti fuimus noscentes quomodo Vos, Dilecte Fili Noster, ac Venerabiles Fratres, inhaerentes consiliis Nostris et huius Apostolicæ Sedis istic Nuntii, Mechliniæ proximo mense Iulio in unum congregati ad alia eiusdem Universitatis tractanda negotia, vestras quoque impendistis curas in aliquo suscipiendo consilio, quo huiusmodi controversiæ plane amoverentur et extinguerentur. Quæ nostra consolatio summopere crevit, ubi intelleximus, has vestras curas locum habuisse in Epistola, quam die 31 eiusdem mensis Iulii communi consensu ad Magnificum eiusdem Universitatis Rectorem dedistis. Namque in eadem epistola elucet ac dominatur illud concordie prudentiæque studium tantopere necessarium ad pacem tuendam, atque ad removendum quidquid christianæ paci et publicæ fidelium edificationi obesse possit. Atque maiore etiam lætitiâ perfusi fuimus, vix dum cognovimus, ipsius Lovaniensis Universitatis Professores, obsequenter excipientes consilia et regulas a Vobis per eamdem epistolam expressas, declarasse unanimiter se eisdem consiliis et regulis plene adhærere sine ulla excep-

tione. Verum dum vehementer lætabamur, hoc modo controversiam finem habuisse, summo certe animi mœrore novimus, per articulos publicis ephemeridibus insertos, aliaque scripta recens vulgata operam datam esse, ut controversia ipsa revivisceret, et in hunc finem invocatas fuisse decisiones a Nostri Congregationibus editas, et a Nobis probatas, quæ minime existunt. Atque id evenit propterea quod nonnulli cuidam Documento illud pondus attribuere voluerunt, quo documentum idem plane caret, cum illius contextus et verba omnem de Congregationis decisione ideam evidenter excludant, nec ullum indicium præbeant, Pontificiam Nostram interpositam fuisse auctoritatem, quæ reapse interposita non fuit. Itaque optime præ oculis habentibus innumeras maximasque utilitates quæ ex mutua animorum concordia derivant, sine qua religio et scientia prosperos exitus consequi nunquam possunt, Nobis summopere cordi est, Dilecte Fili Noster, ac Venerabiles Fratres, omnem occasionem omnino de medio tollere et eliminare, quæ concordiam ipsam quovis modo vel leviter turbet et imminuat. Quocirca nullam prorsus proferentes sententiam de doctrinarum merito, quæ præsentem excitarunt controversiam, et quarum definitivum examen et iudicium ad hanc Apostolicam Sedem unice pertinet, volumus atque mandamus, ut eandem doctrinarum tum fautores tum oppugnatores, donec definitivum de ipsis doctrinis iudicium hæc Sancta Sedes proferre existimaverit, se omnino absteineant sive docendo, sive cuiusque generis scriptis vel in lucem typis edendis, vel alia quavis ratione vulgandis, distribuendisque, tam cum auctoris nomine, quam sine nomine auctoris, ac sive factis, sive consiliis aliquam ex prædictis philosophicis ac theologicis doctrinis exhibere ac tueri veluti unicam, veram, et solam admittendam, ac veluti catholice Universitati propriam. Insuper præcipimus, ut sub quovis prætextu se absteineant novas de hac re iterum excitare questiones, quæ christianæ charitati et animarum salutis vel maxime adversantur. Vestrum autem erit, Dilecte Fili, ac Venerabiles Fratres, istis fidelibus curæ vestræ commissis hanc Nostram Pontificiam ordinationem voluntatemque significare, quæ, uti confidimus, ad exoptatam animorum tranquillitatem et concordiam servandam ac fovendam, Deo bene iuvante, maxime conducet. Certi vero sumus, Vos pro eximia vestra pastoralis sollicitudine omnes curas cogitationesque ad eundem assequendum finem esse collaturos, ac summa vigilantia, ubi opus fuerit, opportuna consilia communi vestrum omnium consensu provide sapienterque esse suscepturos quoad docendi rationem in Lovaniensi Universitate, et unumquemque vestrum idem omni studio in propria Diœcesi esse curaturum. In eam profecto spem erigimur, fore ut Belgii clerus ob egregiam illam, qua semper eminuit erga Nos et hanc Sanctam Sedem, observantiam et venerationem omni docilitate et obsequio hanc Nostram ordinationem sit excepturus, quam propter gravissimas causas, et peculiari rerum ac temporum adiuncta dandam esse censuimus ad maiorem sanctissimæ Nostræ religionis utilitatem in isto regno procurandam. Denique hac etiam occasione libentissime utimur, ut iterum testemur et confirmemus præcipuam Nostram erga Vos benevolentiam. Cuius quoque certissimum pignus esse volumus Apostolicam Benedictionem, quam ex intimo corde profectam, et cum omnis veræ felicitatis voto coniunctam Vobis ipsis, Dilecte Fili, ac Venerabiles Fratres, cunctisque clericis laicisque fidelibus cuiusque vestrum vigilantia conceditis peramanter impertimus."

Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum die 19 Decembris anno 1861, Pontificatus Nostri anno decimo sexto.

PIUS PP. IX.

*Tum S. Pater rem omnem examinandam commisit duabus Sacris Congregationibus nempe supremæ Inquisitionis et Indicis; quid autem Emi Patres iudicaverint patet ex sequenti Epistola.*

*Illustris ac Rme Dne uti Frater.*

“Quum non levis momenti sit pluribus abhinc annis istis in regionibus agitata questio circa doctrinam a nonnullis Universitatis Lovaniensis doctoribus traditam *de vi nativa humanae rationis*, SS<sup>mus</sup> D. N. qui in Apostolicæ Sedis fastigio positus advigilare pro suo munere debet, ne qua minus recta doctrina diffundatur, questionem illam examinandam commisit duobus S. R. E. Cardinalium Conciliis tum S. Officii tum Indicis. Iam vero cum esset huiusmodi examen instituendum, præ oculis habitæ sunt resolutiones, quas sacrum idem Concilium Indicis edidit iam inde ab annis 1843 et 1844, posteaquam ad illis iudicium delata saunt opera Gerardi Casimiri Ubaghs in Lov. Univ. doctoris decurialis, inprimisque tractatus Logicæ ac Theodicæ. Etenim sacer ille Consensus matura adhibita deliberatione duobus in conventibus habitis die 23 mensis Iunii an. 1843 ac die 8 Aug. 1844 emandandas iudicavit expositas tam in Logica quam in Theodicea doctrinas de humanarum cognitionum origine, sive ordinem metaphysicum spectent sive moralem, et illarum præsertim quæ Dei existentiam respiciant. Id sane constat ex duobus notationum foliis, quæ ex eiusdem sacri Consensus sententia Gregorii XVI. Summi Pontificis auctoritate confirmata ad Eminen- tissimum Card. Archiep. Mechliniensem per Nuntiaturam Apost. transmissa fuerunt, monendi causa auctorem operis—*ut nova aliqua editione librum suum emendandum curet, atque interim in scholasticis suis lectionibus ab iis sententiis docendis abstinere velit*—Quæ duo notationum folia, modo res spectetur, simillima omnino sunt; si namque in folio posteriori aliqua facta est specie tenus immutatio, id ex eo repetendum est, quod auctor accepto priori folio libellum die 8 Dec. an. 1852 Emo Archiepiscopo tradidit, quo libello doctrinæ suæ rationem explicare atque ab omni erroris suspitione purgare nitebatur. Quem sane libellum licet idem Emorum Patrum Concilium accurate perpendisset, minime tamen a sententia discessit, atque adeo tractatus illos ac nominatim tractatum de Theodicea, qui typis impressi in omnium versabantur manibus, atque in universitate, aliisque scholis publice explicabantur, corrigendos iudicavit. Fatendum quidem est, post annum 1844 nonnullos intervenisse actus, quibus prædicto Lov. Doctori laus tribuebatur, perinde ac si in posterioribus sui operis editionibus sacri Consensus voto ac sententiæ parvisset; sed tamen uti certum ratumque est, bina illa notationum folia post sacri eiusdem Concilii sententiam Summi Pontificis auctoritate comprobata, fuisse conscripta, ita pariter certum est, posteriores illos actus haudquaquam S. Consensus, multoque minus Summi Pontificis continere sententiam, quod quidem actus illos legentibus videre licet. Quæ quum ita sint, necessarium investigare ac perpendere visum est, utrum memoratus Lovaniensis doctor in editionibus Logicæ ac Theodicæ, quas post diem 8 mensis Augusti an. 1844 confecit, accurate sit exsecutus quod a S. Concilio libris notandis inculcatum ei fuit in memoratis notationum foliis per Cardinal. Archiepiscopum eidem auctori transmissis. Huiusmodi porro instituto examine rebusque diu multumque ponderatis, memorati Cardinales tum qui S. Inquisitioni, tum qui libris notandi præpositi sunt, conventu habito die 21 Septemb. proximi præteriti, iudicarunt, *recentes eorumdem tractatum editiones minime fuisse emendatas iuxta prædicti Sacri Consensus notationes, in iisque adhuc reperiri ea doctrinæ principia, quæ uti præscriptum fuerat, corrigere oportebat.*



"Quod quidem auctor ipse recenti in epistola ad Eminentissimum Card. Ludovicum Altieri Præf. S. Concilii libris notandis missa aperte fatetur. Scribit enim quatuor adhuc se publicasse Theodicæ editiones, primam nimirum an. 1841 quæ primitus subiecta est S. Sedis iudicio, alteram an. 1845 typis impressam haud ita multo post notationes a S. Card. Consensu propositas. Utraque vero editio, quemadmodum suis ipse verbis fatetur auctor—*Similes prorsus sunt, idem capitum, paragraphorum et paginarum numerus, eadem locutiones; hoc solum differunt, quod secunda editio aliquot diversi generis notas et paucas phrasas incidentes continet, quæ simul paginas forte duodecim implere possint. Editiones vero ut ipse prosequitur, tertia an. 1852, et quarta an. 1863 etiam inter se similes sunt et a præcedentibus, si formam exteriorem, non doctrinam spectes, multum differunt.*—Ad Logicam porro quod spectat, cum illius tractatum iterum typis mandavit, post acceptas S. Consensus notationes, hæc in præfatione significavit.—*Quantumcumque scripta immutaverim, nunquam minime recedendum esse duxi a principiis, quæ in primis editionibus assumpseram, quæ tamen repudiare vel mutare me non pueret, si illa falsa vel minus recta esse quisque ostendisset.*—Hinc pariter memorati Cardinales indicarunt, exsequendum ab auctore esse quod minime adhuc præstitit, nimirum emendandam illi esse expositam doctrinam in cunctis iis locis seu capitibus, quæ S. Consensus lib. notandorum Iudex minus probavit, iuxta notationes in supradictis duobus foliis comprehensas et peculiariter in primo, utpote quod rem apertius ac distinctius explicat. Ex quo tamen haudquaquam intelligendum est probari doctrinas reliquas, quæ in recentioribus operum prædicti auctoris editionibus continentur. Hanc porro Emorum Patrum sententiam SSmus D. N. Pius IX. auctoritate sua ratam habuit et confirmavit.

"Quæ cum ita se habeant, dum Emus Card. Mechliniensis iuxta demandatas ei partes memoratum doctorem Gerardum Casimirum Ubaghs admonere officii sui eique vehementius inculcabit, ut doctrinam suam ad exhibitas S. Consensus notationes omnino componat, erit vigilantie tuique studii pastoralis una cum Archiepiscopo aliisque suffraganeis Episcopis omnem dare operam ut huiusmodi Emorum Patrum sententia executioni nulla interiecta mora mandetur, neque in ista Lovan. Universitate, quæ ab Archiep. Mechlin. et Suffrag. Antistitem auctoritate pendet, neque in seminariorum Scholis aliisque Lyceis illæ amplius explicentur doctrine, quæ uti primum ad Apost. Sedis iudicium delatæ fuerunt, visæ sunt a scholis catholicis amandandæ.

"Hæc significanda mihi erant Emorum Patrum nomine amplitudini Tuae cui fausta omnia ac felicia precor a Domino."

Amplitudini Tuae

Romæ, die 11 Octob. 1864.

Addictissimus uti Frater  
C. Card. PATRIZI.

*Doctor Ubaghs novam Logicæ et Theodicæ editionem elucubravit anno 1863. Nonnullis ex Præsulibus Belgicis visum est eundem Auctorem ne in hac quidem novissima editione id sufficienter præstitisse quod ei ab Emis Patribus fuerat inculcatum. Hæc nova itaque editio in examen a S. C. revocata est, et sequens prodit documentum.*

"De libris philosophicis G. C. Ubaghs in Lovaniensi Universitate doctoris decurialis, et præcipue de novissima tractatum *Logicæ et Theodicæ* editione anno 1865 ab ipso confecta, nondum tamen evulgata, Eminentissimi Patres Cardinales tum S. Inquisitioni, tum libris notandis præpositi, conventu

simul habito die 21 Februarii proxime elapsi quam accuratissime examen instituerunt. In primisque quod ad doctrinas attinet a S. Congregatione Indicis iam inde ab annis 1843 et 1844 notatas, non potuerunt quin egro quidem animo deprehenderent, cl. auctorem in novissima prædictorum tractatum editione exterioris formæ asperitatem utique attenuasse, verba quandoque molliisse, eadem tamen quoad substantiam nunc decere principia, quæ in præcedentibus editionibus reperiebantur: proindeque indicarunt, hanc novissimam editionem haud fuisse emendatam iuxta notationes annis 1843 et 1844 auctori transmissas, et duo a S. Congregationibus S. Officii et Indicis anno 1864 eidem inculcatas.

“Præterea, quod iam prout ex litteris meis ad singulos in Belgio Episcopos die 11 Octobris anni 1864 datis sibi faciendum reservaverant memorati Cardinales, alias doctrinas examinandas susceperunt, quæ in recentioribus operum eiusdem auctoris editionibus continentur. Et vero perspicere debuerunt, tradi in illis libris doctrinas plane similes aliquot ex septem propositionibus, quas in adiecto folio Eminentia Tua enunciatas reperiet, quasque Suprema S. Officii Congregatio die 18 Septembris anni 1861 haud tuto tradi posse iudicavit (\*); et alias quoque in iisdem libris opiniones referri, quæ caute minus quam fas esset, exponuntur. Ita declaranda potissimum omnino essent et emendanda, quæ in *Anthropologia* anno 1848 Lovanii edita pag. 221, n. 428 leguntur de opinione, quam *Traducianismum* vocant, et quæ ibidem pag. 457 et 458 n. 514 occurrunt de vitæ principio in homine. Quare Eminentissimi Cardinales in hanc devenere sententiam:—In libris philosophicis a G. C. Ubaghs hactenus id lucem editis, et præsertim *Logica* et *Theodicea* iuveniri doctrinas seu opiniones, quæ absque periculo tradi non possunt.—Quam sententiam SSmus D. N. Pius Papa IX. ratam habuit et suprema sua auctoritate confirmavit.

“Ex quibus Eminentia tua facile intelliget huiusmodi pericula a iuvenum mentibus opportuno præsidio esse propulsanda: hinc necessarium omnino erit, ut nedum illi libri iisque similes ab Universitate catholica Lovaniensi et a Scholis omnibus arceantur, veram etiam ea adhibeantur opera communi Episcoporum consensu et auctoritate probata, quibus iuvenilis ætas irreprehensibilis et sana doctrina in celebri illa Universitate imbuatur.

“Non dubitatur, quin professor G. C. Ubaghs ea, qua præstat virtute, aliique Lovanienses professores eisdem opinionibus adherentes, huic iudicio pareant; neque est cur Eminentie tuæ maiorem in modum commendetur, ut collatis consiliis cum Episcopis suffraganeis tuis, omnem operam ponas, ut hæc, quæ Summi Pontificis nomine præcipiuntur, continuo executioni tradantur, et de omnium executione Apostolica Sedes fiat instructa.”

Romæ 2 Martii 1866.

*Hoc documentum cum ab Episcopis eorum notitiæ traditum esset ad quos spectabat, nonnulli non ita interpretati sunt ut parcat; aiebant nimirum doctrinas a quatuor Professoribus die 1 Februarii 1860 Carl. De Andrea expositas, neque ab iis, neque a prioribus reprobari; quare iterum a S. C. rescriptum est prout sequitur:*

*Eminentissime ac Reverendissime Domine Observandissime.*

“Accepi binas literas ab Eminentia Tua proxime ad me datas, quibus adiunctæ erant epistolæ ad Professores Universitatis Lovaniensis ab Episcopis istius ecclesiasticæ provincie in unum collectis missæ, et responsiones datæ

(\*) Hæ propositiones sunt illæ, quas adduximus p. 204 et 205.

tum a Rectore illius Universitatis Magnifico, tum a viro cl. G. C. Ubaghs. Istarum epistolarum omnium notitiam habuerunt Emi Patres una necum Inquisitores generales : quibus opportunum, imo necessarium visum est, ut nedum hæc documenta, verum etiam alia, quæ, sicut ad me scribis, in manu Tua sunt, cœtui Episcoporum subiiciantur : tum vel magis quod memoratæ Universitatis professores aliqui et ii præsertim, qui notatis opinionibus adhæserunt, postremam S. Sedis resolutionem non ita interpretantur et explicant, uti par esset, et uti menti utriusque S. Congregationis S. Officii et Indicis apprimè responderet. Fac igitur, quæso, ut Episcopi suffraganei Tui quam primum apud Te conveniant, hæc de re agant et efficiant, ut professores, notatis opinionibus iam adhærentes, resolutioni S. Sedis plene, perfecte absoluteque se submittant. Non dubitat S. Congregatio, quin hoc negotium in omni patientia ad exitum deducere velis, et omnia referre, quæ collatis consiliis cum Episcopis suffraganeis Tuis statuta fuerint et executioni tradita. Interim Eminentię Tuæ manus humillime deosculor."

Eminentię Tuæ  
Humill. devotus Servus verus  
C. Card. PATRIZI.

Romæ die 3 Iunii 1866.  
Dno Card. Archiep. MECHLINIENSI.

*Hiscæ communicatis litteris Professores illi dubitarunt adhuc, existimantes non quidem doctrinaliter suas opiniones, quas die 1 Februarii 1860 exposuerant, fuisse reprobatas, sed tantam disciplinaliter.*

*Eme Princeps, Præsules Illmi, Revmi.*

"In consessu Episcoporum Belgii hesterno die habito, placuit Vobis communicare nobiscum epistolam, quam die 3 Iunii ad Emum Cardinalem Archiepiscopum Mechliniensem dederat Emus Cardinalis Patrizi. Ibi aliquot e venerabili vestro cœtu Episcopi nobis manifestarunt, se quidem in ea versari sententia, ut putent, ex illa epistola, attentis decretis S. Sedis circa scripta D. Ubaghs, constare nostram de evolutione humanæ rationis opinionem a S. Sede doctrinaliter fuisse damnatam. Ipsi nos tum hac de re a Venerabili vestro cœtu interrogati, respondimus : Velle nos lubentissime nos abstinere ab illa opinione sive ore sive scripto docenda ; attamen non esse nobis hactenus plenissime persuasum prædictam opinionem fuisse a S. Sede doctrinaliter damnatam, quum hæc damnatio nobis videretur confici non posse neque ex decretis S. Sedis, neque ex rationibus, quas hanc in rem nonnulli e venerabili Vestro cœtu attulerunt.

"Grato animo hic recordamur quod, postquam nos discentes benigne audissetis, uno ore de nobis testati estis omnes Eme Princeps, Præsules Illmi, Revmi, certo vos scire nos ita esse animo comparatos, ut plene, perfecte absoluteque stare velimus omni S. Sedis decreto eidemque, statim ac nobis innouerit, nos submittere.

"Itaque Venerabili Vestro cœtui placuit petere a nobis, ut opinionem nostram distincte exponeremus, a Vobis deinde iudicio S. Sedis subiiciendam. Cui petitioni lubenti animo satisfaciennes hæc declaramus.

"Primo. Plenissime nobis esse persuasum, hominem post lapsum Adami posse per se, hoc est solis suæ naturæ viribus ipsi insitis, absque ulla revelationis supernaturalis et gratiæ subsidio, cognoscere atque demonstrare existentiam Dei et alias quasdam veritates metaphysicas externas. Sentimus, veritates illas externas ex principiis rationis et contemplatione rerum creaturarum certissima deductione demonstrari posse. Videmur autem nobis per hanc declarationem reicere omnia illa, quæ in utroque decreto 23 Iunii 1843

et 8 Augusti 1844 S. Congregationis Indicis a S. Sede in scriptis D. Ubaghs fuere notata, una cum falso principio, cui hæc innituntur.

"Secundo. Plenissime nobis esse persuasum, hominem, cuius quidem ratio sit quisque evoluta, posse ad earum veritatum, quas diximus, iis mediis, quæ diximus, cognitionem pervenire, etiamsi nulla earum veritatum illi ope cuiusvis institutionis tradita fuerit. Consequitur ex hac declaratione nos pariter sentire, esse ad cognoscenda ea, quæ de Deo naturaliter sciri possunt, revelationem necessariam non absolute et physice, sed moraliter tantum.

"Tertio. Declaramus nos subscribere sequentibus R. P. Perronii verbis, quæ professoribus philosophiæ commendavit Concilium provinciæ Rhemensis in civitate Ambianensi anno 1853 habitum et a Sede Apostolica approbatum. *Cum loquimur de facultate, quæ pollet humana ratio, Deum cognoscendi eiusque existentiam demonstrandi, eam significamus satis exercitam atque evolutam, quod fit ope societatis atque administracionum, quæ in societate reperiuntur, quæque certe sibi comparare haud potest, quæ extra cæterorum consortium evitritur et adolescit.*

"Quarto. De protoparente nostro Adamo, quum non fuerit creatus in statu infantie, sed hominis quoad corpus et quoad animam perfecti, declaramus sentire nos, eum potuisse sine ulla institutione externa et sine ulla revelatione ad eum rationis usum pervenire, quo distinctam acquisivisset notionem existentie Dei et aliarum veritatum ordinis naturalis.

"Pergratum nobis erit a Sede Apostolica edoceri, utrum ea, quæ hic a nobis sunt exposita, ab ipsa theologice fuerint damnata, ideoque a quovis catholico prorsus sint reiicienda."

I. Th. Beelen, SS. Pii IX Cubicul. ad hon. S. Script.  
et ling. Or. prof.

I. B. Lefebvre, theol. dogm. prof.  
Leodii 1 Augusti 1866.

*Episcopi Professorum dubia SSmo Patri iterum exposuerunt sequentibus literis.*

*Beatissime Pater.*

"Summa intellectu set cordis submissione accepimus litteras et mandata Beatitudinis Vestre circa difficultates doctrinæ in Universitate catholica Lovaniensi, maximasque agimus gratias Sanctitati Vestre, quod definitivum illud iudicium edere dignita sit.

"Quum ad nos pervenissent dictæ nomine Emi D. Cardinalis Patrizi signatæ die 2 Martii currentis anni, mox convenimus Mechliniam, ut collatis consiliis præceptorum Sedis Apostolicæ urgeremus executionem. Die 21 eiusdem mensis Martii litteras edimus ad Rectorem Magnificum istius Universitatis et alteras ad viros ecclesiasticos in illa professores, hisce additas, quibus rescriptum Sedis Apostolicæ cum illis communicavimus, obedientiam promptam commendantes. Imo documentum filialis obedientiæ, ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestre deponendum, petivimus a Professoribus illis, qui notatis doctrinis adhæserunt. Libenti animo hoc documentum nobis tradiderunt et illi et alii quoque ecclesiastici professores. Cl. G. Ubaghs, nobis hortantibus, statim cathedræ suæ renuntiavit, et iam otio usus operibus suis corrigendis dat operam.

"Postea singuli in diocesi sua professoribus seminarii decisiones S. Sedis tradidimus, eos hortantes ad sanctam submissionem. Non mediocri sane gaudio testamur, omnes seminariorum professores summa veneratione verisimulque mentis et cordis assensu desideriis nostris satisfacisse.

"Sed quum ita exultaremus in Domino, tristis ad nos pervenit rumor de interpretatione nova decisionis apostolicæ. Disciplinalis est, aiebant, non

doctrinalis; docere non possumus ea, quæ sunt reprobata, sed corde servare licet ea, quæ publice docebamur; alii dicebant: singulares cl. viri Ubaghs opiniones de vi nativa mentis humanæ improbatæ sunt, sed minime attinguntur ea, quæ professores Lovanienses quatuor exponebant in suis litteris die 1 Februarii 1860.

"Qui rumor dum spargeretur, cl. doctor Lefebve, unus e quatuor illis professoribus, ad Rmum Episcopum Namurcensem scripsit, suam esse hanc interpretationem. Rector autem Universitatis, cl. Laforet, repetitis litteris ad eundem Episcopum datis, dixit hanc explicationem, cui adhærebat cl. Beelen, non esse suam, sed a se ut probabilem et licitam haberi. Rmus Episcopus Namurcensis et alii duo Episcopi epistolam D. Lefebve miserunt ad S. Sedem.

"Talis erat rerum status, dum Leodium, ad hanc aliasque res tractandas convenimus die Iulii currentis anni.

"In prima congregatione die illa 30 Iulii, Emus Cardinalis Archiepiscopus litteras Eminentissimi Cardinalis Patrizi diei 3 Iunii prælegit, quibus declaratum vidimus, necesse esse, nos convenire de hac re agere et efficere, ut professores notatis opinionibus iam adhærentes resolutioni Sanctæ Sedis plene, perfecte absoluteque se submittant.

"Mox advocavimus in cætum nostrum duos professores supracitados, qui mentem suam aperirent. Die sequenti adfuerunt, et ad longum sensa sua exposuerunt, præsertim dicentes, se toto corde amplecti omnes S. Sedis decisiones, sed ex litteris an. 1864, et 3 Iunii eiusdem anni sibi non liquere expositionem doctrinalem a quatuor professoribus factam anno 1860 attingi. Nos autem iudicamus in hoc solo puncto totam hodiedum questionem versari. Ipsi vero, nobis petentibus, sequenti die adiectum documentum exhibuerunt.

"Igitur ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestræ provoluti supplicamus, ut in hisce rerum adiunctis dignetur Sanctitas Vestra declarare, an dicta Expositio an. 1860 reipsa sit reprobata nec ne in declarationibus supradictis.

"Benedictionem Apostolicam Nobis et fidelibus curæ nostræ commissis enixe efflagitamus."

Sanctitatis Vestræ

humillimi, obedientissimi et devotissimi famuli

† Engelbertus Card. Arch. Mechl.

† Gaspar Ios. Ep. Tornacen.

† Theodorus Episc. Leodien.

† I. I. Episcop. Brugen.

† Henr. Episcop. Gandaven.

† Vict. Aug. Ep. Namurcen.

Leodii 1 Augusti 1866.

*Post hæc Emus Card. Patrizi nomine SSmi Domini ita rescripsit.*

*Eme ac Rme Domine Obsme.*

"In litteris ab Eminentia tua tuisque suffraganeis Episcopis die 1 huius mensis Augusti ad SSmm Dominum nostrum Pium PP. IX. datis iudicium petitur ab Apostolica Sede super dubiis quibusdam excitatis a I. Th. Beelen et I. B. Lefebve in catholica Lovaniensi Universitate professoribus circa responsiones Sacrarum Congregationum S. Officii et Indicis tum anno 1864, tum hoc anno 1866 Summi Pontificis auctoritate sancitas. At non ea sunt ista dubia, quæ novam rei iam definitæ interpretationem ac declarationem requirant: iis enim penitus diluendis per ipsas Sacrarum Congregationum responsiones fit abunde satis. Imo non sine admiratione auditum est,

huiusmodi dubitationes fuisse propositas. Omnia profecto ad questionem Lovanii agitatam spectantia, ideoque etiam doctrinæ expositio a quatuor Lovaniensibus professoribus die 1 Februarii anno 1860 subscripta ad examen fuerunt revocata et præ oculis habita, dum per memoratas responsiones quæstio definiretur. Porro viri catholici, multo vero magis ecclesiastici id muneris habent, ut decretis S. Sedis, plene, perfecte absoluteque se subiciant, e medio sublatis contentionibus, quæ sinceritati assensus officerent.

“Hæc sunt, quæ nomine SSmi Patris a me significanda erant Eminentiæ tuæ, ut ea cum Episcopis Suffraganeis communicare velis, et una cum iis prædictos Professores, aliosque idem sentientes moneas in Domino et magis ac magis cohorteris ut sententiæ Apostolicæ Sedis ex animo, sicut eos decet, acquiescant.”

Interim Eminentiæ Tuæ manus humillime deosculor  
Eminentiæ Tuæ

Humill. devotiss. Servus tuus,  
C. Card. PATRIZI.

Romæ die 30 Augusti 1866.

*D. Cardinali Archiepiscopo Mechliniensi.*

*Itaque Episcopi Mechliniæ congregati ad Rectorem Magnificum et Professores ecclesiasticos litteras dederunt, quibus prædictam responsionem notitiæ eorum traderent, atque ad subscribendum filialis obedientiæ documentum eos adigerent; quæ litteræ sunt sequentes:*

*Magnifice Domine Rector, Professores clarissimi ecclesiastici almae  
Universitatis Catholice Lovaniensis.*

“Mense Martio cURRENTIS anni ad vos misimus litteras Emi Card. Patrizi circa difficultates doctrinales Lovanii motas, et petivimus documentum filialis obedientiæ decretis S. Sedis Apostolicæ...Accepimus sinceras declarationes, quas ea de re ad nos misistis, sed mox rumor sparsus est, sensum et vim responsionum Romanorum a quibusdam professoribus non intelligi ut par esset, et reipsa clarissimi Domini Professores Beelen et Lefebvre hunc rumorem veritate niti nobis declararunt, suumque votum ulterioris explicationis a S. Sede obtinendæ nobis manifestarunt, dicentes, expositionem doctrinæ suæ factam die Februarii 1860 non esse reprobata. Nos autem puritatem doctrinæ simul et animorum tranquillitatem cordi habentes denuo aussu fuimus ad SSmum Dominum supplices accedere, humillime rogantes per litteras diei 1 Augusti ut dignaretur dubia exorta novo lumine dissipare. Pater Optimus benigne vota nostra excipiens ad nos mitti mandavit litteras quarum transumptum hic iuxta mandatum Apostolicum inserimus.

“Porro ex aliis litteris eiusdem Emi Cardinalis liquet, præfatam expositionem doctrinæ 1 Februarii 1860 comprehendi in resolutione utriusque Congregationis S. Officii et Indicis die 2 Martii huius anni edita.

“Hæc decisiones adeo claræ et luculentæ sunt, ut causa tamquam definitive decisa habenda sit. Scimus autem firmissimam SSmi Domini voluntatem esse, ut erroribus sublatis omnes idem sentiant. Itaque ut in perpetuum omnes dissensiones extinctæ permaneant, et in quæstione diu agitata iamque definita nihil optandum expectandumque supersit, mittimus formulam litterarum subscribendam ab omnibus, qui vel doctrinas reprobata tradiderunt, vel iisdem aliquo modo adhæserunt.

“Has litteras quamprimum recipere gratissimum erit, ut quantocius in

manibus SSmi Domini deponantur, et cordi eius hisce temporibus tam dire vexato levamen adferant.

"Quaecumque bona, quaecumque salutaria vobis a Deo, omnis boni auctore, precamur."

Mechlinæ, 17 Dec. 1866.

*Rector autem et Professores, ad quos Episcoporum præscriptio spectabat, documentum quod sequitur filiali obedientia subscripserunt atque tradiderunt.*

Eminentissime Princeps, Illmi ac Revmi Antistites,

"Obsequens mandatis Vestris hocce documentum filialis obedientiæ vobis exhibere festino, humillime rogans, ut per manus vestras ad pedes SSmi Domini Pii PP. IX. deponatur.

"Decisionibus S. Sedis Apostolicæ diei 2 Martii et 30 Augusti huius anni plene, perfecte, absoluteque me subiicio, et ex animo acquiesco. Ideoque ex corde reprobō et reiicio quamcumque doctrinam oppositam, nominatim expositionem doctrinæ a quatuor professoribus subscriptam et die 1 Februarii anno 1860 ad Emum Cardinalem Præfectum S. Congregationis Indicis transmissam, aliaque ad quæstionem Lovanii agitatam spectantia, quæ Sedes Apostolica reprobavit.

"Profunda veneratione et omnimoda subiectione permaneo,

"Eminentissime Princeps, Illmi ac Rmi Antistes."

Humillimus et obedientissimus famulus.

Lovanii... Decem. 1866.

---